

THE SOCIAL WELFARE FORUM, 1951

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS, 78th ANNUAL MEETING

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF SOCIAL WORK

ATLANTIC CITY, NEW JERSEY, MAY 13-18, 1951

1951

PUBLISHED FOR THE

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF SOCIAL WORK

BY COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS NEW YORK

*Copyright 1951, National Conference of Social Work, Columbus, Ohio
Published by Columbia University Press, New York*

PUBLISHED IN GREAT BRITAIN, CANADA, AND INDIA
BY GEOFFREY CUMBERLEGE, OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON, TORONTO, AND BOMBAY

MANUFACTURED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA



Foreword

CONFERENCE PUBLICATIONS FOR THIS, the 78th Annual Meeting of the National Conference of Social Work, reflect much discussed but recently inaugurated modifications in program planning and Conference emphasis and focus. This new arrangement provides for the grouping of section meetings around three broad areas, namely, Services to Individuals and Families, Services to Groups and Individuals in Groups, and Services to Agencies and Communities. In addition, the three Common Service Committees on Professional Education, Public Relations, and Social Research were responsible for arranging simultaneous meetings during hours that the sections were not in session.

This, the first volume of publications, entitled *The Social Welfare Forum, 1951*, contains all the papers presented at the General Sessions as well as a selected group from the three section meetings. Included also are some papers presented either at meetings sponsored by the Common Service Committees or at sessions jointly sponsored and planned by thirty-one of the Associate and Special Groups. This particular volume contains papers of broad import to the field which are of general interest.

Many excellent papers of particular interest to special groups are to be published in two additional volumes. These publications will deal with specific areas of practice. One of the publications will be of special interest to caseworkers, and the second will have particular value and usefulness for individuals in the fields of group work and community organization. This modification in previously announced plans for Conference publications grows out of the expressed interest and desire of the membership.

Selection of papers for this particular volume was not an easy task. The Editorial Committee, as in previous years, was guided in making its decisions by certain broad criteria, one of the most significant being that the papers selected should contain new and significant information which had immediate practical value to the

membership and, in most instances, historical significance to the profession. This was a hard-working Conference, and the papers presented testified to the knowledge, skill, and abilities of Conference participants.

This volume is believed by the Editorial Committee to reflect accurately the scope and varieties of subjects to which Conference attention was directed. Research and its vital import to the field of social work had a prominent place in Conference activities. This prominence and emphasis are appropriately reflected in this publication. The papers in these proceedings cover a wide variety of subjects, ranging from "The Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth" to "The American People in the World Crisis," "The Place of the Sectarian Agency in Services to Groups," and "Solving Health and Welfare Problems through Neighborhood Participation."

Committee members, in addition to the chairman, who participated in the selection were David French (New York) and Leah Parker (New York). Joe R. Hoffer, Executive Secretary, and Ruth M. Williams, Executive Assistant to the Conference, served in an ex-officio capacity. Again, Mrs. Dorothy M. Swart, of Columbia University Press, ably carried responsibility for editorial work on the manuscript, for which the Committee is especially grateful.

BESS CRAIG
Chairman

Cleveland, Ohio
September 1, 1951

The Survey Award

AT THE GENERAL SESSION on Monday night, May 14, 1951, Edith Abbott, professor and dean emeritus of the School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago, was presented with the 1951 Survey Award "for imaginative and constructive contribution to social work." The award, a bronze plaque, is presented annually at the Conference by the *Survey* as a memorial to the late Edward T. Devine, one of the founders of the magazine.

Miss Abbott was chosen as the 1951 recipient by a committee under the chairmanship of Ollie A. Randall, of the Community Service Society of New York, who made the presentation. The other members of the committee were Miller Barbour, Lucy P. Carner, Gunnar Dybwad, A. A. Heckman, Mrs. Louella Sauer Hunt, Lillian J. Johnson, John C. Kidneigh, Mrs. Rosemary Morrissey, Henry Redkey, Arthur G. Rotch, Isadore Sobeloff, Mrs. Sumner Spaulding, Forrester B. Washington, and Benjamin Youngdahl.

CITATION OF EDITH ABBOTT

By OLLIE A. RANDALL, Chairman of the Award Committee, May 14, 1951

EDITH ABBOTT, it is my happy privilege to present to you the Edward T. Devine Memorial Award and Plaque for 1951. This Award was established by Survey Associates in 1948 to be given annually for "imaginative and constructive contribution to social work." In carrying out my share in this impressive ceremony, I am acting under the mandate of the 1951 Award Committee, a group of social workers and citizens who are proud to name you for this

distinct honor. They are, in the final analysis, merely spokesmen for that great number of social workers and civil servants whose philosophy of work and life has been deepened either directly or indirectly through your thoughtful leadership.

At the close of the first century of our country's experiment in democracy as a way of life, you were born in the Midwest, the heart of America. With this beginning and heritage it is not strange that you, your sister Grace, and those others of that small band of women whose names are forever writ on the scrolls of social work history, and of our country, by your foresight, vigorous curiosity, and questing, indomitable spirit, should undertake, early in the twentieth century, to point out to the social work profession, with a clarity in which there was something of the prophetic, the inescapable challenge of those new frontiers in human relationships then but vaguely sensed, and still to be more fully explored and charted. As social settlement resident, teacher, administrator, author, and editor, you have consistently spared no one who *should* be concerned in your efforts to effect close cooperation between social work and all branches of government concerned with people of all ages, but especially with the children of the nation. Your penetrating intelligence also brought you—and through you others—to see (as you have said), “the great importance of bringing the University to the service of the problems of social welfare” so that “humanitarian work may become more scientific” and “the work of the social scientist may be quickened and strengthened by being brought to the service of humanity.” Your unswerving allegiance to this purpose, and your selfless devotion to a cause are today reflected in the improvement of public and voluntary social work, in the development of schools of social work, and in better living conditions for countless human beings everywhere.

As dean emeritus of the School of Social Service Administration of the University of Chicago, as former president of the National Conference of Social Work, as recipient of honorary degrees for your outstanding scholarship and work in education, it seems peculiarly fitting that to you should go this Award in memory of Edward T. Devine, another great pioneer in the movement to provide edu-

cation to those who would go forth to engage in one of the most vital and most difficult of all tasks—so to help one's fellow man that all men may ultimately be helped to a fuller and richer life.

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH
DELIVERED BY EDITH ABBOTT

AT PRESENTATION OF SURVEY AWARD

MADAM CHAIRMAN, I shall not take time thanking you for an honor that I know is completely undeserved. It is fitting, however, that the *Survey* has chosen the Conference as the setting for presenting its annual honor to social workers. In my long Conference membership, the Conference has done a great deal for me, as it did for my sister, Grace.

I wish now to express my obligation to the two great institutions with which I have been connected over the years: Hull House, the first American social settlement, and the University of Chicago, which was the first of the great universities of the world to recognize our profession by establishing a graduate professional school of social service.

Grace and I went together to our first Conference in 1909 at the end of the first year after we began our long period of residence at Hull House. The Conference was then thirty-six years old but it had never elected a woman president, although most of the members were women. That year, 1909, Jane Addams was finally elected president. But there was so much feeling about its being unsuitable to have a woman president, that Miss Addams was advised to make a nice little speech, thank the Conference, and then withdraw in favor of a man. But they didn't know Miss Addams! She did make a nice little speech, but she said that as the men had had thirty-six years to think it over and finally decided to elect a woman, no one could say they had acted hastily.

I want to use my last minute or two for what I consider our important next step in social work. I never make any kind of speech these days without urging that the great objective of social workers today should be the abolition of the means test. How? By substituting children's allowances—for all children—in place of ADC. Canada has done this, and England has done this, and, if poor England can do it, surely we can do it. Social security is not social security when it reaches only the destitute.

We should give children's allowances instead of ADC and grant old age pensions to everyone at a certain age without any question as to need. I am sure that the time will come when we shall do this.

This is one of the new roads to freedom that we need a little courage to find. An English friend said to the Man who stood at the Gate of Time, "Give me a light that I may go forward into the Unknown." But the Man replied, "You do not need a light, you can go forward into the darkness if there is courage in your heart."

Our early leaders had courage, and they taught us to look forward, too eagerly perhaps, to the social welfare country—our undiscovered country—where there shall be:

No glory or beauty or music or triumph or mirth
If it be not good for the least of the sons of the earth.

Contents

FOREWORD

Bess Craig v

THE SURVEY AWARD vii

CITATION OF EDITH ABBOTT

Ollie A. Randall vii

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH

Edith Abbott ix

Building Social Welfare for Democracy

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE IN THE WORLD CRISIS

Stringfellow Barr 1

THE COMMON CORE OF SOCIAL WORK IN DIFFERENT COUNTRIES

Donald S. Howard 19

THE HUMAN ASPECTS OF MOBILIZATION

Frank P. Graham 37

THE RESPONSE OF SOCIAL WORK TO THE PRESENT CHALLENGE

Joseph P. Anderson 47

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY OF SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION

Harriett M. Bartlett 61

THE MIDCENTURY WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH

Ira De A. Reid 73

SPECIAL NEEDS OF CONGESTED COMMUNITIES AND OF DEFENSE WORKERS

James B. Carey 82

COMMUNITY VALUES IN CIVIL DEFENSE	
<i>James J. Wadsworth</i>	92
DOMINANT AND VARIANT CULTURAL VALUE ORIENTATIONS	
<i>Florence Rockwood Kluckhohn</i>	97

Research in Social Welfare

FACT-FINDING AND THINKING AS TOOLS IN POLICY-MAKING	
<i>Ewan Clague</i>	114
PAST AND FUTURE IN SOCIAL WELFARE RESEARCH	
<i>Philip Klein</i>	130
SAMPLING FOR RESEARCH IN SOCIAL AGENCIES	
I. WITH LARGE CASE LOADS	
<i>Anne E. Geddes and Walter M. Perkins</i>	148
II. WITH SMALL CASE LOADS	
<i>Bertram J. Black and Charles P. Gershenson</i>	158
MODERN METHODS OF MEASURING PUBLIC REACTION AND THE APPLICATIONS OF THESE METHODS TO THE SOCIAL WEL- FARE FIELD	
<i>Rensis Likert and Ronald Lippitt</i>	170

Services to Individuals and Families

FURTHER NEEDS IN THE SOCIAL INSURANCES	
<i>Eveline M. Burns</i>	181
THE CASEWORKER'S USE OF COLLATERAL INFORMATION	
<i>Helen Harris Perlman</i>	190
MODERN CASEWORK RECORDING: INTEGRATING CASEWORK AND SUPERVISION	
<i>Marguerite M. Munro</i>	206

Contents xiii

CURRENT EMPHASES IN CASEWORK UNDER RELIGIOUS AUSPICES

I. INTEGRATION OF CASEWORK AND OTHER PROGRAMS

Henry J. Whiting 215

II. DEVELOPMENTS IN CASEWORK PROGRAMS

Katharine E. Griffith 224

CONSTRUCTIVE ASPECTS OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE FOR THE AGED

Elmer V. Andrews 236

THE PUBLIC AGENCY LOOKS AT ITS REHABILITATION PROGRAM

Mary E. Switzer 244

WHAT CAN CASEWORK SAY TO THE PUBLIC IN THESE TIMES?

Eva Burmeister 253

FEES FOR SOCIAL WELFARE SERVICES

Alice T. Dashiell 263

Services to Groups and Individuals in Groups

THE PLACE OF THE SECTARIAN AGENCY IN SERVICES TO GROUPS

Nathan E. Cohen 271

GROUP WORK WITH HARD-TO-REACH TEEN-AGERS

Estelle Alston 281

INTERCULTURAL AND INTERRACIAL RELATIONS IN CAMPING

Margaret E. Hartford 295

Services to Agencies and Communities

THE LAYMAN EXAMINES SOCIAL WELFARE IN A DEMOCRACY

Sadie T. M. Alexander 304

SOLVING HEALTH AND WELFARE PROBLEMS THROUGH NEIGHBORHOOD PARTICIPATION

Violet M. Sieder 311

CRITICAL ISSUES OF COUNCIL-AGENCY RELATIONSHIPS	
<i>Ray Johns</i>	323
BASIC POLICIES AND PRINCIPLES OF PUBLIC CHILD CARE SERVICES	
<i>Martha Branscombe</i>	335

Appendixes

A. PROGRAM	349
B. BUSINESS ORGANIZATION OF THE CONFERENCE FOR 1951	371
INDEX	375

The Contributors

- SADIE T. M. ALEXANDER, member, Philadelphia Bar, Philadelphia
- ESTELLE ALSTON, Supervisor, Special Service Unit, Los Angeles Youth Project, Los Angeles
- JOSEPH P. ANDERSON, Executive Secretary, American Association of Social Workers, New York
- ELMER V. ANDREWS, Deputy Commissioner of Welfare, State Department of Institutions and Agencies, Trenton, N.J.
- STRINGFELLOW BARR, President, Foundation for World Government, New York
- HARRIETT M. BARTLETT, Associate Professor, Simmons College School of Social Work, Boston; Chairman, Study Committee, National Council on Social Work Education
- BERTRAM J. BLACK, Assistant Executive Director, Jewish Board of Guardians, New York
- MARTHA BRANSCOMBE, Director, Elizabeth McCormick Memorial Fund, Chicago
- EVA BURMEISTER, Director, Lakeside Children's Center, Milwaukee
- EVELINE M. BURNS, Professor of Social Work, New York School of Social Work, Columbia University, New York
- JAMES B. CAREY, Secretary-Treasurer, Congress of Industrial Organizations; President, International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, C.I.O., Washington, D.C.
- EWAN CLAGUE, Commissioner of Labor Statistics, Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.
- NATHAN E. COHEN, Professor of Social Work, New York School of Social Work, Columbia University, New York
- ALICE T. DASHIELL, Executive Director, Family Agency of Chester County, West Chester, Pa.
- ANNE E. GEDDES, Chief, Division of Program Statistics and Analysis, Bureau of Public Assistance, Social Security Administration, Federal Security Agency, Washington, D.C.
- CHARLES P. GERSHENSON, Research Associate, Psychological Research Institute, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York
- FRANK P. GRAHAM, Administrator, Defense Manpower Administration, United States Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.

- KATHARINE E. GRIFFITH, Executive Secretary, Diocesan Bureau of Social Service, Hartford, Conn.
- MARGARET E. HARTFORD, Assistant Professor of Group Work, School of Applied Sciences, Western Reserve University, Cleveland
- DONALD S. HOWARD, Dean, School of Social Welfare, University of California, Los Angeles
- RAY JOHNS, General Secretary, Young Men's Christian Association, Boston
- PHILIP KLEIN, Professor of Social Work, New York School of Social Work, Columbia University, New York
- FLORENCE ROCKWOOD KLUCKHOHN, Lecturer, Department of Social Relations, and Research Associate, Laboratory of Social Relations, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
- RENSIS LIKERT, Director, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
- RONALD LIPPITT, Program Director, Research Center for Group Dynamics, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
- MARGUERITE M. MUNRO, Supervisor, Family and Children's Division, Brooklyn Bureau of Social Service and Children's Aid Society, Brooklyn, N.Y.
- WALTER M. PERKINS, Analytical Statistician, Division of Program Statistics and Analysis, Bureau of Public Assistance, Social Security Administration, Federal Security Agency, Washington, D.C.
- HELEN HARRIS PERLMAN, Associate Professor, School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago, Chicago
- IRA DE A. REID, Professor of Sociology, Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.
- VIOLET M. SIEDER, Associate Director, Health and Welfare Planning Department, Community Chests and Councils of America, New York
- MARY E. SWITZER, Director, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Federal Security Agency, Washington, D.C.
- JAMES J. WADSWORTH, Deputy Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Washington, D.C.
- REV. HENRY J. WHITING, Executive Secretary, Lutheran Welfare Society of Minnesota, Minneapolis

ors
So-
ool
of
on,
cial
Re-
ons,
of
Dy-
on,
ety,
Sta-
rity
vice
ver-
ing
few
ed-
nse
So-

THE SOCIAL WELFARE FORUM, 1951



The American People in the World Crisis

By STRINGFELLOW BARR

I TRIED SEVERAL YEARS AGO in *The Pilgrimage of Western Man*,¹ which is a kind of history of modern Europe—of modern Europe's civilization, of which the United States is a fraction—to talk about how Western culture had in vain been spread over all the continents of the earth. To some extent it spread through military subjugation, sometimes with infinite cruelty to other peoples in a movement that was called "imperialism," sometimes with such horrors as bringing human slaves from Africa to this country, but it has spread and by this decade it has come to embrace a planet. This is true to an amazing degree.

A couple of years ago when I went back to France, a country I had lived in as a young man, I was utterly astonished by the degree of integration with us. Perhaps I was astonished in part by the degree of Americanization of the French. I found I no longer understood the French language. I was a little bewildered by this, because I spoke it as a young man about as easily as English, until I finally found out why I was not understanding it. The French language was full of American words, not pronounced in the way I had been accustomed to hearing them.

Somehow this is typical, and all over the world, in all those parts I have been privileged to visit, one is conscious of how near everybody is physically. It is very polite to talk about the new world community, but you have to see an awful lot of this planet, as Wendell Willkie once saw an awful lot of this planet, in order to get the feeling of how compressed the world population now is, how immediate the contacts are. For people who have not traveled in coun-

¹ Stringfellow Barr, *The Pilgrimage of Western Man* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1949).

tries other than their own, it is a very exciting experience to sit at an international airport for an hour. The continual stream of people back and forth from every country in the world is one of the incredible sights of our generation and one we cannot fully conceive in our imaginations. We can talk about it and we use the right words, but we do not feel the words.

In the book I speak of I tried to say how it came about. It is a long story that is in some ways a glory to man and in some ways a disgrace. The fact is that we now live in a world community that is unique in recorded human history. It is the first time that mankind has ever been gathered under one roof. And there is another brutal fact, and that is that we have been gathered under one roof without being properly introduced to each other. The process has been a little too hasty, like a rather badly organized party, and some of the guests now present are glowering at each other.

I went about a year ago to South America, primarily as the guest of the American International Association set up by Nelson Rockefeller, an organization that does most of its work in Venezuela and Brazil. But I managed to see not only the work of that organization, but some of the things that were being done by the other private and governmental organizations in a good many countries in South and Central America. As I look back on that trip, it is a blur of very violent images, most of them rather horrible images, some of them fantastically humorous images. In the latter category I think of an agricultural experiment I witnessed in Costa Rica, which had only one purpose—to find the answer to the following question: "Can you raise a hog exclusively on bananas?" Because if so, Costa Rica is sitting pretty. The answer when I was there seemed to be "yes." I had met the hogs in question. I like bananas myself and so I did not offer them sympathy.

There were some more horrible images too which have stayed with me like nightmares. Images of acute malnutrition, not the kind of famine that India is suffering, but acute malnutrition; of widespread disease; great ignorance; great political apathy; great social indifference of the rich regarding the poor; and of how much a small amount of money and knowledge can do to alleviate the suffering. I returned, and one of my friends tried to make me write

about what I had seen and I felt absolutely unable to do so. What was in my mind was a jumble of very vivid images. I looked at those images for a while; and, during the summer, I sat down and I thought I would try to say something in book form on why our whole effort in this country, that we call Point Four, "know-how" and "show-how"—why our whole Point Four discussion seems to have gotten badly off the track. I noticed, for instance, some extraordinary facts. While I was in Latin America, there were some Congressional hearings in progress, and also while I was in Latin America, a member of the United States Senate, Brien McMahon of Connecticut, made a rather famous speech for which he was warmly commended not only by his colleagues but by the more literate portion of the American press. Brien McMahon suggested that the problem of world misery had reached such proportions that in order to crack it this country should stand ready to put up, as its share to tackle the job, \$5,000,000,000 a year for ten years. And at approximately the same time the Senate Appropriations Committee cut the Point Four appropriations from \$45,000,000 to \$10,000,000, which is about what New York City spends attempting to keep its streets clean and to empty its garbage.

It seemed very clear to me that either Mr. McMahon had gone crazy or that the committee had gone crazy, or that they were not talking about the same thing—the most charitable of the three hypotheses. What is this thing that ought to be under discussion?

When I sat down I wondered how to describe what I think I saw. I had read about it before, but it had not clicked. How do you describe the dislocation in the world economy? And how do you describe the technique now known and used in many parts of the world by many organizations operating on a small scale? A thought did come to me about it.

I concluded that our discussion of foreign policy was off-base because Americans are cut off by their wealth from the rest of the human race. This country is a suburb surrounded for the most part by slums, and people who live in suburbs do not easily imagine what it is like to live in slums. Wealth has always been very damaging to human beings, and it seemed obvious to me that not only our Point Four discussion, but our whole foreign policy had gone

askew precisely because they were designed to confront a problem which we had never even imagined. And I asked myself how I could talk it about in such a way that an ordinary reader would get it, and I conceived the idea of imagining that the reader had not yet been born but would be born tomorrow, and of asking him what he thought his chances were in the world that exists today—not the world that apparently exists in the imagination of members of Congress.

I ask your indulgence as I quote a page or two of my pamphlet in which I am attempting to look at the actual condition of mankind:

I believe there is a trick by which we Americans can understand these two billion men, women, and children scattered all over the globe. Will the reader play "Let's pretend" with me, the way children do? Let's pretend that you have not yet been born but will be born this year, somewhere on the planet, somewhere in this Mighty Neighborhood. And let's try to estimate your chances of living a happy, healthy, decent, and useful life.

If you are born this year, then on the same day more than 200,000 other babies will be born, all over the world.

You will have less than one chance in twenty of being born in the United States. Your chance of being born in the Soviet Union will be not much better. These countries may be heavily armed, but most people just don't live in them.

You will probably be colored. Remember that you and the 200,000 other squawking brats who will be the day's baby crop are going to be born all over the planet and that there are just not many openings in the places where the white race lives. You must take your chances with the other babies. And the chances are, you will be colored—colored black, or colored brown, or colored yellow.

Your chances of being born white this year are not more than one in three. Your chances of being Chinese are one in four; of being born in India, better than one in nine.

If you are born colored, you will probably be born either among people who have recently revolted and thrown out the white folks who used to govern them or else in a country that is still trying to throw the white folks out. If you are born in Africa, you are likely to learn the maxim: "Never trust a white man."

You have only about one chance in four of being born a Christian. It is far more likely that you will be born a Confucian or a Buddhist, a Mohammedan or a Taoist.

If you are born in the United States—and, remember, that's quite an *if*—you will probably live longer than a year. But if you are born in India, which is more likely, you have only a little better than a one-to-four chance of living more than a year. But cheer up! your chances in some places would be worse; and, besides, even if you survive babyhood in India, you have only a fifty-fifty chance of growing to maturity.

If you are born colored, the chances are overwhelming that you will be chronically sick all your life—from malaria, or intestinal parasites, or tuberculosis, or maybe even leprosy. And even if you are not chronically sick, you are likely to be weak from hunger. You have about a two-to-one chance of suffering from malnutrition, either from too little food or from food that is not a balanced or nourishing diet. You have a reasonably good chance of experiencing real famine—to the point where you will be glad to eat the bark off a tree. But this chance is extremely hard to calculate.

Again, if you are born colored, you have only a one-to-four chance of learning to read. And since you almost certainly will not own a radio, you will be pretty well cut off from that part of the human family that has enough to eat and that is reasonably healthy. You will most likely live in a mud hut, with a dirt floor and no chimney, its roof thatched with straw. You will almost certainly work on the land, and most of what you raise will go to the landlord. In addition, you are likely to be deeply in debt to the local moneylender, and you may have to pay him annual interest of anywhere from 30 to 100 per cent.²

That is necessarily an inaccurate account of the world. The statistics of the sort I just used must result from a competent census; and the parts of the world I am describing are not rich enough, as a rule, to take a census. But the figures are substantially accurate, and I think I have leaned to the conservative side.

I am aware, and social workers must be even more aware than I, of how much real human misery there is in the rich suburb itself—the United States of America. Taking the American population by and large, we are the darling of the gods; and the picture I gave is, I think, substantially correct. In that world our foreign policy has almost zero meaning. And in that world our Point Four program has almost zero meaning. I asked myself, "Where did we get off the track?" It was becoming clear even to Americans who had not traveled that American policy was becoming less popular by

² Stringfellow Barr, *Let's Join the Human Race* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950), pp. 2-3.

the hour, that we were losing touch with the rest of the human race, that in some sense we did not belong to the human race. We had to find out how to get back into it. And I asked myself, "On what assumptions is our foreign policy actually based today?" And I came up with these:

False assumption number one is that Russia is all that stands between mankind and a stable peace. Most Americans accept that assumption. Very few people outside America accept it. To the people I have just been describing, Russia is not the problem. The problem is human misery. Communism, which we spend our time denouncing, is a proposed solution to that misery, and the question is, "Do I hear any other bids?" The Point Four plan cannot classify as a bid. It is too weak, too little, and too American. Do we hear any other bids?

The bulk of the world's population is in the position of a patient being attended by two doctors. One of the doctors, Russia, says, "I have a pill here which will cure anything that ails you," and the other doctor, the United States, is saying today, "Don't trust that guy, he's a quack, period." What do you think the patient will do? He wants to get well. He knows it is possible to get well, and he does not want to hear speeches about free enterprise. He does not want to hear speeches about know-how. He wants to know, "When do we eat?"

If we tell him that we have arranged to have all the Russians in the world die tomorrow noon, and that this will mean that we will all live in peace, I think he will say, "Have you made any arrangements for frying them? Because otherwise you haven't touched my problem." So that while we scream about "freedom and liberty" to the human race, these people are being inattentive.

They are being inattentive except in one particular. They know the cause of our hysterical interest in Russia. They can blackmail us.

Blackmail is very fashionable this year. We are blackmailing India, and there are Indians who are dying of hunger while we are sitting on a pile of wheat we cannot eat. When they ask us for some of it, we say to them in effect, "How are you going to vote in November? Because if you vote right you will live; if you propose to vote wrong you will die." This looks like prudence to some of

the members of the United States Congress, but it looks like blackmail to the bulk of the human race; and I was delighted to find on a trip I made through the Middle West that more and more Americans are dissociating themselves from that blackmail. What they are doing, you may have seen in the papers: they are individually buying a sack of wheat and sending it to the Indian Embassy. This is their way of saying, in the words of Samuel Goldwyn, "Include me out." They are saying: This Congress is legally representing me, but on this issue it is not morally representing me, and I am doing the only thing I can about it. I am sending the wheat direct. My own hope is that so much wheat will reach the Indian Embassy that the Ambassador will not be able to get through the front door, and that Herblock will put a cartoon in the *Washington Post* that will shame even the Congress.

Now, I said a moment ago that to many Congressmen this looked like prudent policy. Like so many efforts to substitute the practical for the moral, it is not even prudent. Appearing as blackmailers to the peoples of Asia is not the constructive thing for Americans to be doing even from the point of view of the narrowest national interest. And by the way, there is a political party in Asia which is talking about us with such eloquence that there is not the slightest danger that anybody will be left uninformed of our blackmail, not the slightest. Mind you, I think they would have heard anyway, but I think they will hear it more frequently because of the Russian radio.

But other people can blackmail, too. We are being blackmailed right and left on necessary raw materials. It was a field day for countries with no industries to speak of but with raw materials, when we went "big" on national defense. And there are some other forms of blackmail. There is a story that is popular in Europe today, but I do not hear Americans telling it to each other. The story goes this way. A certain Asian government sent a cablegram to a certain Latin American government as follows: "Send us two Communists at once." The Latin American government was a little bewildered and cabled back: "What do you want with two Communists?" And the reply came instantly: "Because we have no Communists and we have no hope of aid from Washington until we get a few." This

story is very popular in the world today. This is the blackmail season; and to the extent that the human community is not behaving like a community we will expect blackmail. Blackmail is one of the numerous symptoms of community decay. I shall not try to keep score on the morals of the various blackmailers. We are all so guilty that it hardly seems necessary to keep score. And we are all being so stupid and so silly and so foolish and so irrelevant that it hardly seems worth while keeping score.

False assumption number two, on which American foreign policy rests, I think—or certainly the Point Four discussion—is that American know-how and American money can rebuild the world economy, or enough of it to stop Russia. If you watch the discussions around Point Four, I think you will detect this assumption.

In the first place, I'd like to drop out of that sentence "enough to stop Russia." There is a hideous human problem that is curable and there are better ways of curing it than stopping Russia, and certainly better reasons from the point of view of the two billion people that are neither Russians nor Americans and are a little sick of both. I would like to say: How do you tackle this problem?

Let us stop thinking about Russia just long enough to consider the problem of the two billion human beings. I know you may feel that you cannot turn your head for an instant or they will strike. Let George Marshall watch them just for five minutes, will you? He is a very trustworthy character, and the contribution that you and I and most of us are making to national defense by thinking of nothing but Russia twenty-four hours a day is not substantial. So let us allow George Catlett to keep his eye on Russia while we look at the non-Russian, non-American world.

Do you seriously think that the economic plight that I have tried to describe can be handled by the American government? It clearly cannot. I am not sure that I am prepared to say that the American government cannot muster the necessary funds. That is not too easy to prove. "Where is the money coming from?" is the question usually asked by the people who are not very knowledgeable about bookkeepers. There are also some other issues, like where is the steel coming from in the middle of an arms race. I am interested by the fact that the United States Congress has no business con-

sidering this problem as essentially an American problem. Who told them it was purely an American problem? I am rather happy at some of the balking I have witnessed in the United States Congress. Some of the reasons given for balking do not seem to me valid reasons, but the balking is fairly sound. It is not an American problem, it is a world problem and for the world community to handle. Do we seriously want the American government to be playing Santa Claus to the human race? It is a very unhealthy relationship.

Some months ago a brilliant French journalist, who was traveling in this country on a State Department fellowship, wrote in an article in the New York *Herald Tribune* as follows: "Last week something happened in Washington that is utterly astounding, without precedence in history, and that the average American knows nothing about. The French government submitted its next annual budget to the American government before submitting it to the French National Assembly." This has never happened in history before. Perhaps I sound hard-boiled, but I think they were correct in submitting it. They are on our budget now, you know. If I asked you to let me go on your budget, it seems reasonable to me that you should take an interest in the fact that I may smoke too many Camels. I can cut down without injury to my health, and you might want to know what my budget looks like. So it is fairly inevitable that if the American government is going to subsidize other governments, which is what we have been doing, then it will take a friendly interest in the budgets of the subsidizees. The New York *Times* carried a fairly characteristic story. Indonesia refused to vote for our Chinese resolution, placing an embargo on China, and then at the last minute Indonesia said they would not send any rubber to China but they would expect some aid from America. You don't smell any blackmail, do you? They will get aid, don't you worry, they will get aid.

This kind of thing is bound to go on, and if the American Congress does take care of all God's chillun, it will not only take an extraordinary interest in the budgets of other countries, it will also take an interest in their military position, and in their political theories. In fact, we will be absolutely fascinated by them. The ordinary Congressmen, it seems to me, would be well within their

rights to be fascinated because they will say: "The people in Topeka didn't tell me to take care of Indonesia. In order to help Indonesians, which I would like as a good Christian to do, I am going to have to show how helping Indonesians helps Topeka." It is simple, because injuring Russia always helps Topeka. If there is any Point Four in what we do, we do it now as a means of hurting Russia.

The President recently appointed a commission to report on Point Four. The commission, chaired by Nelson Rockefeller, came up with a report entitled "Partners in Progress." The report contains some excellent material. But it has an over-all thesis that the human race is in a hideous condition and we ought to help it as one aspect of our national defense problem. Now there are a number of people in the world who do not want to be an aspect of our defense problem. They like to eat but they do not want to eat subsidies. They wish they could get their bread straight.

I was talking to a woman the other day, who said that the really interesting stuff at the United Nations, which she frequently attended, was going on behind closed doors. And I said: "How do you get behind doors?" She shows her NGO (Nongovernmental Organization) card so that it will look like a press card. She said, "I found out that the technical assistance people in the UN complain that they can't do their job because the American government undercuts them constantly." A country comes to them and appeals for help, and the UN says, "Well, we'll give help, but only under these conditions. There is very little we can do, given your present social and political arrangements, but if you do something about those conditions, we'll help." The country walks out the door and goes down to Washington and says, "The UN seems to be balking on this problem; can you help?" And we say, "Whose team are you on?" And they say, "On yours, of course." And we say, "You get the help."

The conditions that the UN was laying down had to do with the problem, and Washington's question did not have to do with the problem. This is demoralizing to the Technical Assistance Program of the UN. We Americans object that the Technical Assistance Program does not have much money anyway. Naturally, because we and other countries have jolly well seen to it that it does not have

much money. The reason we offer for not giving them the money to do the job internationally is the same reason a parent does not give his children an allowance. The kid "doesn't know how to use money," and a kid often remains in that position for life.

I do not think there is any possibility that the American government will do this job, and my only consolation is that I do not think it ought to. Of course, along with this problem there is an immense amount of self-flattery. We talk about American know-how, the implication being that nobody outside the United States can even tie his shoe without assistance. Our technology came, I imagine all persons know quite well, from a place called Europe; and technology in Europe is doing very nicely, thank you. They do not have as much money to spend on developing certain aspects of technology as we have but they have a great engineering tradition; and for us to talk about technology as if it were an American invention is to be impertinent and slightly ludicrous in the eyes of people all over the planet who have read a little history. A large number of them have read a little history. In fact, in many countries they read more history than Americans read. So that we are appearing a little bit foolish in talking about know-how as if it were an American monopoly.

We are even talking foolishly when we talk about money as being an American monopoly. Following the Second World War, for perfectly definite reasons, a terrible dollar shortage developed, and this was a real fact—but one cannot infer from the dollar shortage that no other currency than ours is current in the world. It is amazing how current other currencies are when you are in the countries where they *are* current. People buy things and sell things and above all people buy human labor—which is the basic requirement for getting this job done. They do not have to spend dollars. They spend the local currency. Then there are intermediate currencies, which are much less soft than the local currencies but still less hard than the dollar now is; and a lot of machines can be bought not only from the United States but from Europe and are being bought from Europe by countries that cannot yet make their own machinery. So that an international kitty into which each country put its appropriate share, and I would hope no more, could use all the money

it could get. Nothing would straighten out our relations with the rest of mankind quicker than for us to be putting up our share and not one nickel more than our share. At present we are doing a lot of wrist-twisting and a lot of arrogant talking because we are putting up more than our share for this job we have been doing. If we were putting up in proportion, then we might recapture a little of our lost sense of modesty and sit down with our neighbors on a job that is as much their problem as ours, if not more theirs.

Assumption number three—and this is worse, I think, than number two—is that free enterprise, what the non-American world still calls “private” enterprise, can do the job better than the government. If the American voter will not permit Congressmen to use his tax money for a general rejuvenation of the planet (and I contend he will not), then the American investor is certainly not going to put money into Standard Oil or some outfit like it and then expect that outfit, that business corporation, chartered for a profit-making business, to go into some country which lacks roads, schools, hospitals, and spend his investment on things that the charter of the oil company said nothing about—that the prospectus sent him when he bought stock said nothing whatever about. I think he will sue and I think he will win. It is fantastic to assume that oil companies or any other kind of business corporations are going to do a job that they have never done anywhere in the world, including the United States. If you had waited for U.S. Route 1 to be built by free enterprise, I think, my friends, you would still be waiting. There are a lot of perfectly sound reasons for this, and it is no rebuke to free enterprise, it is no rebuke to business. I do not know any valid reason why any private American corporation should have built U.S. Route 1. You can say it is good for business. Yes, it is good for the business of other corporations too. It is good for a lot of people’s business. Why should one of the businesses build the road so that all the businesses can use it? It just does not make sense, and yet some very important business leaders solemnly appeared before Congressional committees scarcely more than a year ago and announced that this whole problem could be handled by free enterprise. This is infantilism at its worst, and the quicker we get such

nonsense out of our heads the quicker we will attend to the root of the problem and find the solution.

Now what is the solution? I do not know. In my case, this is partly a matter of lacking certain kinds of professional competence. I do know this, that a great many economists of very high stature, and a great many engineers of equally high stature, are not basically alarmed by the scope of this problem. They know the techniques for handling such problems. They have never tackled one this big. Nor have they ever before had as many means for tackling one this big, and they are sure that the problem can be, shall we say solved or shall we say handled, at least to a degree where we would have a completely new international scene—where the disorder that bubbles up in Korea, Iran, all over the world, would give way to a spiral of prosperity, where hope would take the place of despair in most of the countries of the world and where—since most of us do not approve of Communism—where Communism would not be the only doctor that actually offers the medicine.

Now it seems to me that the first big job to throw light on the kind of a solution we would have to seek is the Tennessee Valley Authority. I think that chronologically this is the first time (I know it happened all inside one country; in fact, inside one part of one country) that public funds raised by taxation were combined with high technological skills and taken into an area whose economy had lagged behind neighboring economies and brought an economic floor to the community—which, incidentally, immediately attracted private enterprise, and should have, and started an upspiral that put not only the community, where the work was done, on its feet, but helped most American communities, who sold goods for the first time to this community. This is the technique we Americans developed.

A few weeks ago I had the privilege of traveling for a couple of months in the Mediterranean area. I visited eight or ten countries; but primarily the country I was headed for was Israel. Israel, I think, is case number two. This is a TVA job basically, where there were even less propitious circumstances than in the Tennessee Valley—less resource base, no real mineral resources, topsoil chiefly

missing since the seventh century, forests gone. There were a few chemicals in the Dead Sea. Maybe some minerals that they are looking for will be found but the soil is being replaced by methods we have developed only in the past few years.

The so-called "American standard of living" is a strictly new thing. Except for leprosy, I have seen no problem in Brazil that I had not seen in my childhood forty years ago. What we call the American standard of living, which does not yet by any means cover the country, happened yesterday. This is not something the red Indians were enjoying. It happened yesterday.

Now, in Israel, they are transplanting it. They are introducing the two necessary components, technical skill and capital. One without the other has very little meaning, although we talk a bit as if know-how would suffice. Go to a farmer who is really broke and tell him how to run his farm when he has no capital. You know his famous remark, "I already know how to farm better than I'm farming." What he wants is capital. Capital is going to Israel, but the land presents an infinitely more difficult problem than Brazil, infinitely more difficult than nine out of ten countries we could name—one of the toughest on the list. Fortunately, there are several reasons why it can be done—Jewish tradition, secular persecution. More human intelligence exists in Israel to the square yard than exists in any country including ours. More hope exists to the square yard than exists in America in 1951 to the square mile. It reminds one of our 1910 Midwest-Watch-Us-Grow situation. It is terrific!

A third world war might easily lead to catastrophe in Israel, because their technology is of necessity colonial at the moment. It depends on Detroit, on spare parts. The Arab would go on plowing with his wooden stick and the Jewish Israeli would have a tractor that would not run, if no shipping were available. They are in a precarious position; but few places in the world present as serious a problem of technology and capital as Palestine presents. We know how this job can be done. I suggest that what is needed now is a kind of international authority with international funds, internationally controlled. I cannot say how all the details of this would operate. That question is beyond my personal competence. Certainly a large amount of literature exists on the subject, and there is a

considerable amount of hard, practical experience in every continent on the planet.

I have witnessed men and women getting some of the experience; and it is the most exciting thing in the world. I had forgotten—precisely because we have not been in the pioneering mood for the last few years—I had forgotten what an exciting thing real pioneering is, what a really thrilling experience it is to build. I am suggesting that if we once get the problem stated, we and other peoples will find a solution.

At present I think that we Americans are not the only road block, but the principal road block, to finding the problem. And we must find the problem before we solve it. We are still seeing the world as—well, as Russian satellites, over against us and our friends. Us and our friends, the free world which we need, everybody as excited as we are, not only by the Brooklyn Dodgers but by any good ball club. Everybody yearning to preserve their representative institutions—which in many cases do not exist and never have. Presumably everybody eating, because people do eat, don't they? Consequently, we now and then raise the flag and rally our allies—and look around and they are unaccounted for. Then we make speeches about how we all share this ponderous burden—you know. Why don't our allies say what the real problem is?

There are limits to what one can say to a man who has just picked up the check. Be reasonable. Rude remarks are not made to people who pay the bill. A lot of them are made in private, but you and I do not hear them unless we happen to know somebody who was at the place where the private conversation occurred. But do we seriously expect, let us say, the French or the British suddenly to say, "Your policy is not intelligible to our people"? It is an extremely rude remark in the middle of a war, and they have made all the remarks they dared make. Their governments, like many governments, are in the position of saying if we go too far *this* way our people do not follow us and our government fails. If we go too far *that* way, Washington will cut us off the pay roll, and we like aid from Washington. And they try to find that imaginary point between Washington and popular feeling that will keep them in power.

This, I think, is a realistic view of what goes on. If we ever get around to suggesting (and the suggestion would come better from some other source because we have been carrying the financial burden), if we ever got around to a serious suggestion, we would say: "Let's all get together and crack the basic problem. The basic problem, the one that underlies the Communist problem." The Communist problem is a genuine one. It is mixed, of course, and is partly a Communist problem and partly a Russian problem, and they happen to be combined at the moment, which makes it worse—particularly grave for our country because Russia is the only power with power enough seriously to endanger us. (And may I add that the United States is the only state strong enough seriously to endanger Russia?) That tension would exist quite aside from everything else. I would say that just the fact that two states are by a whole lot stronger than any others in the world community would produce that tension. Unfortunately, because this problem is real, because we have to think about it, because Communism seems to us evil, we forget that although Communism looks to us like only a foul conspiracy against freedom, it looks to the average guy in Asia like a tractor. The thing that fascinates him about Russia is the industrialization of Russia under the Communist government. And do not expect him to be fearful that maybe he will lose the vote, because often he has never had the vote. I suggest that if we call in the neighbors and if we say, "Let's get at whatever it is that you and we consider the basic problems of the community that we now find ourselves all living in for the first time, all mixed together, by economic necessity," we could rally world opinion in a way that would be unique in modern history. But we can only do it by joining other people, not by telling them to report in Washington at 3:00 P.M. if they want a handout, not by telling them what to do next.

When China intervened in Korea, the *New York Times* published a statement that read approximately as follows: "As soon as it has been determined in Washington what is to be done, it will be done through the United Nations." This remark did not shock most American readers, but remarks of that sort are now quoted in other countries. Twenty-five years ago, frankly, they did not care

what remarks the Americans made because we were not in the world community in the sense that we are today and we were not as powerful as we are today. Again, when a Congressman gets up, as one did, and says, speaking of the French contributions to the third world war, "We will put up the money, they will put up the boys," that remark has quite a success in the French press. Most Frenchmen heard about it and would have heard about it if there had been no Communist press. It does not sound like a pretty remark if you are sitting in France. It sounded fine in Washington, it sounded wonderful that we did not want our boys killed and we had a lot of money. "We put up the money, you put up the boys." There were a lot of these remarks. When we first entered Korea an American orator got up at Lake Success and, speaking over the radio as well, suffered a slight *lapsus linguae* and spoke of "the United Stations." That term had quite a success in the world too. No, I think we Americans (I know it is true of me at times and perhaps true of you) feel that we have done a lot. We put the Marshall Plan across, and I think we have done pretty well, and yet other people are disagreeing with us. What is wrong now?

We are doing a lot of good for the rest of mankind but we are not working with the rest of mankind. That is what is wrong. And if we should sit down and say, "What are our policies?" instead of saying, "Now, let's see what can be done about your problem," we would find a good policy for ourselves. Take the race problem; it's a honey. In this country we talk about the race problem as a problem with a colored minority. More than one Negro has already suggested modestly that maybe the problem of race is the white problem, not the Negro problem. I offer you another content for this statement. The colored people happen to be a minority in the United States of America, but we white people are a minority in the world community. We are seriously in the minority. Now there are some disadvantages in acting like a majority when we are really a minority, and it seems to me about time that we cut out all that nonsense, which has been brought along with us from earlier history. We move with terrific speed. I am personally sorry. I should like all this to have taken a hundred years instead of ten.

But here we all suddenly are, with different policies or different

theories, all sitting in the same car. It is possible for us to go off the cliff rather than associate with the others, but certainly in a third world war we will be mixed up with them. It is possible also to drop the nonsense and say to the other people, "Let's sit down and examine our problems. You tell us what you consider the chief problems. We're not doing something for you. With you we are doing something for ourselves, for all of ourselves." This would revolutionize our past policies. Most of what we are doing very badly cannot be fitted in that last hypothesis. It cannot be fitted into it. When I came to write about this problem, when I finished trying to state it in brief simple form, I wondered: What do you call this one? I found myself naming it *Let's Join the Human Race*. It seems to me that is the one thing we are not planning at the moment to do, and the eloquent evidence that we are not planning it is our behavior over the wheat to India. If we give it, we will congratulate ourselves over giving a lot to those people.

Instead of congratulating ourselves, let's join the human race. It might be quite a useful experience.

The Common Core of Social Work in Different Countries

By DONALD S. HOWARD

AS ONE FIRST THINKS of what is recognizable as social work over the world there appears to be quite a large core which is common to social work as it is practiced in different countries. However, as one attempts to describe just what it is that social work in various countries has in common, the problem is seen to be extremely complex. Just how complex it is, may be seen by attempting to ascertain the common core of social work even within a single country. For example, just what would you say is the common core in the services rendered by a psychiatric caseworker, a group worker in a hospital, the director of a children's institution, a community welfare council executive, the head of the federal Bureau of Public Assistance, the ranking social worker associated with President Truman's Point Four program? Or would you say that notwithstanding the fact that posts such as these might be filled by social workers, they are not all social work jobs?

Looking at the issue still more sharply, there is often no agreement as to what is the social work content of a single service (such as public assistance) even within one country (such as the United States). For example, a national committee of the American Association of Social Workers studying the social work content of the public assistance job has discovered that some of our professional colleagues thought it to be only "helping with problems inherent in the getting and using of financial assistance." To others, it was this *plus* "dealing with those problems that arise because of, or have contributed to, the need for money." To still others, public assistance was both these things *plus* "making referrals when and if the client has other problems which he himself brings up and with which he asks help." Finally, there are those among us who believe that the social work content of the public assistance job embraces

not only all the foregoing but includes also "considering for direct treatment or referral all the needs of the client and his family that are recognized by the worker and in the solution of which the client is able to use casework help." Obviously, in this widening series of concentric circles there is a common core which is, however, so narrowly conceived that it seems to many observers to represent a gross understatement of its true proportions. If problems like these arise within a single and for the most part like-minded professional group with respect to only one service within a single country, the difficulties in attempting to describe what disparate groups in various countries offering a wide variety of services might regard as the common core of social work in their countries are obvious—almost painfully so.

The wide range of variations within the field of social work was well illustrated in the commission which at the International Conference of Social Work in Paris in 1950 discussed "The Future Role of Social Work." The two representatives of Great Britain in this commission were a Mr. Chinn, welfare adviser in the British Colonial Office, and a Miss Howard, a psychiatric social worker. For the cause of understanding international social work it was extremely fortunate that representatives of such widely different expressions of social work skills—psychiatric casework on the one hand and, on the other, social statesmanship of the broadest type—both came from the same country. Had these two representatives of such vastly different fields been from different countries, the commission might easily have fallen into the error of thinking that the differences in their work could be explained only in terms of national differences. Widely different as were the fields represented, what is one to say is the common core that makes them two phases of the same profession—if, indeed, they are to be so regarded?

As if the problems I had conjured up for myself while working on this paper were not enough, I was plunged further into the depths of confusion by a conversation with a well-known American social worker who is exceptionally well versed on social work as practiced in other countries. Eager though I was to discuss the subject with this eminent authority, she immediately threatened my whole enterprise by declaring challengingly, "But don't you

try to convince me there *is* a common core!" Whereas I had previously been only skeptical, I was now severely shaken.

The problem being what it is, I am reminded of a discussion some nursery school children once had on the question of where was nowhere. In the opinion of one youngster, nowhere was way up on the other side of the sky. "No," shouted the others, "nowhere can't be the other side of the sky because the other side of the sky is the other side of the sky. That is somewhere, so it can't be nowhere." After a moment of silence, another youngster said he knew where was "nowheres." It was down below the earth. Whereupon the youngsters again replied, "No. The other side of the earth is the other side of the earth. That can't be nowhere."

Just as the group seemed to be getting to nowhere very slowly, one youngster who had not appeared to be paying very good attention suddenly broke in with an apparently irrelevant question. "Say," he asked, "are there giants in the world?" To this the group as a whole almost roared its reply, "Naw, of course there ain't no giants in the world." At this, the kid in the back row sagely observed, "Then I know where nowheres is. Nowheres is the inside of giants."

In looking for the common core of social work in different countries one might, indeed, seem to be looking for the insides of nonexistent giants. In my opinion, however, the quest—while admittedly extremely difficult—is considerably less futile than might be supposed. This more optimistic view, it might be said, is shared by another of our colleagues who has also worked closely with social workers who have been coming here from other countries over the past several years. Difficult as it is to define accurately the "common core," the fact that there is indeed such a core is soon recognized, says this authority, because when you sit down and talk with persons who in their own countries work with people and their problems, "You click—just like that"—illustrated with a sharp snap of the fingers. In the words of this expert, even when visitors from abroad had difficulty in understanding our casework, there was in most instances "quick establishment of a common professional ground . . . through discussions of services to people, the rights of people, and the problems for the agency in giving and for the

client in receiving service." What this observer has sensed almost intuitively is what the present writer has been asked to spell out in some detail.

The widely held illusion that the core of social work in one country has little in common with that in others is heightened by the now well-understood fact that the substance and form of social work—like those of any other social institution—in any nation are largely determined by the particular socioeconomic conditions prevailing there. Failure on the part of the uninitiated to understand this basic fact has often led to the perpetration of travesties that would seem laughable were not their consequences so damaging to the cause of social welfare, both on a national and international scale.

Social work which fails to take account of the socioeconomic setting in which it is practiced may easily appear as anomalous as the primitive chieftain who, after being taught by Frank C. Lauback to read, wished to express his appreciation to that missionary teacher of tens of millions of illiterate persons, and to leave no doubt about its depth or genuineness. So he turned to him and asked, "Is there someone you'd like me to kill for you?"

The necessity for adapting to one country the social work practices of another is well illustrated by Eileen Younghusband in her masterly report on social work training in Great Britain, in which she declares:

At present, all the case work text-books are American, and although many of them are of a high standard and are based on research which has isolated certain universal principles, yet this research comes from a society in many ways profoundly unlike our own. Their illustrative cases are of people with many different characteristics, reacting to an environment alien to us, and are couched in language we do not always understand. In other words, case work is too intimately related to the culture pattern of a particular society for the best American material to be a complete substitute for British work of an equally high standard.¹

It was this close interrelationship between American social work and the American culture which also led one of the United Nations social welfare fellows to observe:

¹ Eileen L. Younghusband, *Report on the Employment and Training of Social Workers* (Edinburgh: T. and A. Constable, Ltd., 1947), p. 63.

To study welfare organization [in the United States] without having been in the States before . . . requires a good deal of time and attention to take in the differences of cultural background and the economic system and situation. Discussions about specialized social work [as practiced in the United States] and of generic social work [as practiced in various other countries] showed how difficult it was even for the experienced and scientifically trained American social worker to understand practices of an unknown country.

Another United Nations fellow has reported that study of social work in the United States can be really useful only if the conditions in the observer's home country "are not *too* different from those in the United States":

The conditions under which social work in this country has grown up and matured have been very special. The theories and practices of American social work are so closely connected with these conditions that it is very difficult and even dangerous to introduce these unadapted theories and practices in foreign countries. . . . Often only some "basic principles" can be used and even these contain so many typical American rationalizations that they can only be used very carefully.

Upon returning to his country, said this wise observer, his task would be to rethink for use in his own nation "the fundamental values of American social work on one hand and, on the other, the typically American content as related to the American background."

In the absence of due emphasis upon the interrelation between a nation's culture and its social services, social workers from countries having a stable economy and therefore accustomed to giving, in the form of cash, the economic assistance granted to needy persons, often forget that in areas suffering from runaway inflation or where supplies are almost totally lacking, cash is virtually useless and relief in kind much more to be desired. Social workers from countries with widespread administrative organization and a relatively adequate supply of workers trained and ready for responsible administrative posts often forget that in countries lacking these resources, the employment of one's own relatives and friends (condemned as nepotism in certain other countries) is the only way to be sure that the job will get done and an organization's funds not be stolen. Similarly, in countries with an adequate cadre

of well-disciplined administrative personnel, the operations of social welfare organizations may well be safeguarded by keeping records confidential. However, where there is no trustworthy administrative machinery, the attempt to guard as secret, information regarding the beneficiaries of social services may only play into the hands of unscrupulous persons wanting to exploit those whom they should serve.

Social workers accustomed to the principle of "relative need," that is, the utilization of available resources for the most urgent needs confronting them at any given time, suffer terrible personal anguish when in the face of starving people or ravaging epidemics they must sometimes reserve their inadequate resources, not for those in greatest need—because their resources would be inadequate to help them—but for those in lesser need, because they are the only ones capable of being saved by the resources at hand. Finally, social workers accustomed to working in areas where the basic unit of society is the family or clan, or where the tradition is to appeal to government for everything the community needs, find some difficulty in understanding what is known in other countries as "community organization," that is, the democratic marshaling of the concern and support of various interest groups concerned with a particular community problem.

What was for me a most dramatic illustration of the interrelationship between social services and the prevailing culture was an experience in Paris during the Second World War. A group of welfare leaders from different sections of France were discussing what was "social welfare." In the course of discussion one leader from a rural area asked: "Is teaching children to be dumb, social welfare?" When asked if she did not mean teaching dumb children, rather than "teaching children to be dumb," she replied in the negative, then went on to explain that in the section of the country from which she came they were hiding German-Jewish children, and when they had been unable to teach these youngsters to speak without an accent that might betray their origin and thus lead to their removal, if not destruction, they taught the children to be dumb, never to speak—at home, among friends, on the street, anywhere.

Truly, under circumstances like these, teaching children to be dumb can be social welfare. This fact perhaps explains why it is so difficult accurately to define such terms as "social work" and "social welfare." Definitions must necessarily be related to a given time and place and, even then, will be affected by the needs and conditions of life prevailing in that area at that particular time.

The need for adapting social work in different countries to the socioeconomic settings in which it is practiced might appear, at first glance, to deny the concept of a common core. This view is, however, a superficial one for, running through even these many country-to-country differences in social work there is indeed a core of great significance: the fact that the nature of social work in various countries is largely determined by the values of the particular socioeconomic setting in which it is practiced. The form and manner of adaptation may vary from country to country. Yet, the fact of adaptation appears so widely to characterize social work that this seems to be at least one important aspect of whatever core may be common to social work in different countries.

Notwithstanding the different forms taken by social work in different countries, there appear to be a number of additional elements which may be said to constitute something of a core which social work in these various countries holds in common. But, you may ask, what is social work? Are there really in the various countries giants symbolizing social work whose insides may profitably be explored? This question, I believe, can—with proper qualifications—be answered affirmatively. To other observers, on the other hand, it may appear that the differences—among the giants—in height, in form, in external features, and interior arrangements are so great as to make ludicrous any effort to classify them all as giants.

Admitting, then, that intergiant differences may be very marked—that some giants may be bushy-headed, others bald; some may be twice as tall as others; some may have a second right, but no left arm; some may be plush-lined, others not—what is, generally speaking, the nature of these giants found in different countries?

Such study as I have been able to give to social work in different countries, to discussions with visitors from other countries, and to

the literature of still other countries, suggests that, generally speaking, social work in any country is that discipline, distinguished by a characteristic synthesis of philosophy and knowledge, attitudes and skills, whose primary responsibility is to assist entire societies, communities, groups, and individuals to attain for themselves the highest possible level of well-being but which, when necessary, is responsible also for supplying (directly or indirectly) the goods and services essential to the welfare of the individuals and communities concerned.

To those who are disappointed that social work thus generically defined is not referred to as a profession, let it be said that although this status has been virtually attained in a number of countries, the term "discipline"—suggesting a somewhat looser but still synthesized constellation of skills, attitudes, knowledge, and philosophy, but still without the formal status usually accorded to professions—is really more applicable to a wider range of countries.

As the definition suggests, what is regarded as social work in any country is usually primarily concerned—and this concern surely is another important element in the common core—with social welfare and social well-being. Concepts of what is indeed essential to well-being vary widely, of course, from country to country. Yet, in almost any country "welfare" is usually broadly defined as including at least the following: the means of subsistence, the minimum of shelter and clothing required, essential medical care, and the means of making a living. Usually included also are a wide variety of nonmaterial benefits, such as a sense of security, a sense of "belonging," of being a member of a family (or family substitute) group. This interest in well-being, it must be recognized, is usually much more a fight against ill-being than it is the promotion of constructive measures positively to further "welfare," much as Professor Cahn has said that "the sense of injustice" (rather than the more positive sense of justice) has led to the abolition of one injustice and then another and thus given us a more nearly "just" society.

The very breath of prevailing concepts of welfare has led to what in more sophisticated countries is called "the multidisciplinary" approach, but which in relatively underdeveloped countries has

led to building into a single worker a wide variety of skills including in addition to social work skills those of a health worker, adult educator, home economist, and agricultural extension agent. Even in France and Belgium—as in nations following their pattern of education—there is combined in one worker, usually regarded as a social worker, the training for work which in other countries is normally divided between social workers and nurses.

It is also of the essence of social work in various countries to be concerned (as suggested in the above definition) with the well-being both of individuals and of the "masses." Countries differ widely, however, in their approach to this duality of interest. Depending in part upon the level of their general economic development and the length of time welfare programs have existed, some emphasize primarily the welfare of the individual in the belief that this ultimately best assures the well-being of the community and nation. Other countries, especially those that have not attained a high level of economic development, often feel that such material and technical resources as are available must be concentrated upon improvement of the general standard of living and that this is the only way realistically and on a long-range basis effectively to serve the well-being of the individuals comprising the "masses" thus served. Like most of my compatriots (and thanks to the relatively high prevailing standard of living in our country), I am much more accustomed to the former than to the latter approach. Nevertheless, I have participated in decisions—often confronted in other countries—to plant available grain in order to assure an entire countryside (peopled with *individuals*, it should be recalled) of a harvest another year when at that moment certain people (also individuals, of course) in that same countryside were perishing for want of the very grain that was being planted. Although we in the United States seldom need to make decisions in the face of such stark reality, it is nevertheless sobering to hear fellow social workers from such countries as Denmark and Sweden appraise as "backward" our welfare services, which appear to them to be overly individualized, whereas their own are more geared to the benefit of their entire population. In commenting upon our categorical approach to public assistance, another visitor from abroad asked, "Is

it truly fair, equitable, and democratic to have some groups of needy people more favored than others who are equally as needy, if not more so?" There was also the social worker from abroad who said:

The unevenness that still exists in the social services in America is many times shocking. I imagine that the situation in a great land where the problems are enormous. . . . made it natural, and perhaps necessary, to cut out a small piece of the problem, concentrate the efforts and develop a highly specialized service for the few, when in a small country the very nearness to the social problems and to the people affected. . . . has been a perpetual challenge to service for all. Whatever the reasons for differences in approach in the past have been it has been very interesting and stimulating . . . to see how the services in the two countries from very different starting points now are working closer to each other.

That there is indeed interest in a fusion of the two extremes depicted here is suggested by a visitor from a country which has historically taken the mass approach. Says this worker: "To meet mass need and 'to prevent' was our first concern. We have now, as Mary Richmond said, to 'rediscover the individual.'"

Closely related to this issue but appearing at first to be less a part of the common core than of a commonly attendant circumstance is the fact that it is widely characteristic of social work that it usually (as noted earlier) concentrates first upon the greatest need confronted. Only rarely is this principle of relative need violated because the need to be met is so great and the resources so slim that they must be reserved for the lesser needs which they might conceivably alleviate rather than be "wasted" upon the greater need they are inadequate to meet.

With, of course, significant exceptions in certain countries, social work is usually concerned first with what in international social work "gobbledygook" have been termed "vulnerable groups," by which are usually meant children (and especially children separated from their parents), the aged, the sick or infirm, the handicapped, and pregnant women and nursing mothers.

Another element common to social work as it is practiced around the world is that it is—among other things, as suggested in the definition above—a "helping" discipline as are medicine, law, and

others which also "help" people to get well, "help" people out of their difficulties with the law, etc.

It is characteristic of the discipline of social work that when help is given it is provided in a particular manner. For example, principles agreed to by various international bodies such as the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA) Council often stress the importance of "helping people to help themselves," assuming, of course, that they are able to do so. This idea occurs so frequently in international and foreign social work literature that it would appear to be worthy of consideration as part of the common core. The importance of this concept in many countries is illustrated by the widespread emphasis upon mutual aid, cooperative benefit societies, the *caisse*, and, in fact, the almost universally available social insurance which, although involving other values, certainly stresses this one too.

Just as assisting individuals to attain for themselves the highest possible level of well-being (through casework, rehabilitation, etc.) is regarded as social work, so also, in terms of the above definition, similar assistance given—by a welfare adviser of a British colony, by a French or Belgian colonial welfare officer, or by an American social worker under this nation's Point Four program—to aid whole nations to raise their standards of well-being, may be properly regarded as "social work."

Reference in the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights to the right of all people to the "social services" required and repeated emphasis upon the administration of international welfare services (such as UNRRA relief and aid extended under the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund program), without discrimination on the basis of race, creed, or politics, suggests that here is another aspect of the "help" given by social work which is sufficiently general as to warrant inclusion in the common core. Two interesting illustrations of how at least one country has attempted more effectively to safeguard rights of persons benefiting from social services have come, within the year, from France. There the name of what was once called *assistance publique* was legally changed to *entraide*, better to emphasize its true character and to

dissociate it from public assistance which had previously been regarded more as a benevolence than as a right. Also in France, industrial welfare services have been placed by legislative enactment under the control of joint committees of both labor and management, thus reducing the earlier danger that industrial social work might be used by the management as an instrument for the control of labor or for the mere increasing of production.

Speaking of at least one effect in Sweden of the determination to avoid infringement of human rights, a social worker from that country declared: "The client's right to self-determination has as a matter of fact sometimes been used as an argument against any form of individualized service, in a feeling that such a service inevitably must make him dependent." On the other hand, it is interesting to view our own social work scene as it appears to some observers from abroad as, for example, to the visitor who declared: "I was appalled at the contrast between the institutions for white and colored people, . . . I felt very strongly the inconsistency of the theoretical ideals of democracy and the actual practice of these ideals."

Inseparably identified with this aspect of the common core—as well as being an indispensable concomitant of the principle of helping people to help themselves—is the fact that social work, generally speaking, seems to try to make its contribution without taking out of the hands of those served the responsibility for the control and direction of their own lives, except, of course, as this may be necessary for their own protection or that of others. The extent to which social workers in different countries realize this objective depends upon a wide variety of factors, including the level of development of compulsory school attendance, public health, and other legally sanctioned measures. For example, a leading social worker from a Latin American country once admitted that although social workers in her country preferred not to "boss people around," they nevertheless found themselves—as the servants of the community and in the absence of the necessary compulsory school and health measures—having to "punch people around a bit" in order to get them to keep their children in school or to have their chil-

dren vaccinated. Just how widespread is the human desire not "to be pushed around" was well illustrated during my service with UNRRA in China. When the supply of UNRRA personnel from other countries reached proportions large enough to permit sending considerable numbers of them out into the provinces, a high-ranking Chinese official said to me, "Don, will you please tell these people that the Chinese people are 'different' and do not like outsiders to come into their provinces to tell them how to run their affairs?"

To this I replied, "No. I will not tell them the Chinese are 'different' in this respect, but I will tell them that the Chinese, *like other people*, do not like outsiders to tell them how to run their affairs."

This problem is not a Chinese problem; it is a human problem. People in Sacramento do not like to have people from Washington tell them how to run their affairs, and people in Los Angeles most especially do not like to have people from Sacramento telling them how to run *theirs*. All this, social work knows well; what it knows in this respect is an important part of the common core.

Important as is the element of "help" as part of the common core, social work is much more than this. Especially is it more than helping people to help themselves, for the care of incapacitated persons, young children, and others who might perhaps be unable to lift a finger in their own behalf is also an important part of the core.

Included within the concept of social work in many countries is the provision of such social services as family allowances, unemployment insurance, old age and survivors insurance, which—except as one stretched its meaning almost to the breaking point—would not normally be regarded as embraced by the word "help."

Because "help" so frequently applies to persons or groups who are in trouble, in special need, are atypical and not quite "normal" human beings, because people so frequently resist the necessity of "being helped" (especially when this is not done skillfully and with the respect due to those who are helped), and because certain social services reach such a large proportion of the total population of a

country, the frequently all-too-exclusive emphasis upon social work's "helping" role seems something to be religiously avoided. As one social worker from another country put it:

We should think of social work in relation to the whole community. The field of social work should no longer be the maladjusted alone. . . . why establish a medical care program for the public assistance recipient? The need is to get the health services to put up a medical program within the reach of the average income earner. Why set up classes in nutrition or child guidance for public assistance families? The need is to set up classes for every family. I feel that to be able to identify the needs, to be able to interpret them for the people, to be able to plan how to meet them and get those in the field to meet them, to furnish leadership that is alert and wise, that is social work.

This broad approach in many countries has led to regarding as social work much—including industrial welfare programs, services for farm families, and housing programs—which in these United States has not usually been regarded as within the competence of social work. It is for this reason that in the definition employed above, direct reference was made to social work's responsibility for "supplying (directly or indirectly) goods and services essential to the welfare of the individuals and countries concerned."

While many reports, such as the important study *Social Welfare Administration* recently published by the United Nations, clearly show that social welfare programs in different countries have in common many points of emphasis (and also differ in many important respects), it is much less clear that administration of these services is regarded as social work or that social workers themselves see their administration as their special province. The definition employed here is, however, intended to be sufficiently broad to suggest the propriety of regarding the implementation of these services as within social work's bailiwick.

Reference has already been made to the fact that social work in different countries, if not a full-fledged profession, might be regarded at least as a discipline, and further, as a discipline distinguished by a characteristic synthesis of philosophy, knowledge, attitudes, and skills. What is common in different countries is not, of course, the nature of the philosophy, knowledge, attitudes, and skills or any particular balance of all of these, but rather the fact

that in different countries there are syntheses of this sort which characterize the social work of those countries. This is not of course to say that the philosophy held by social workers of a country is unique to them as a national group or that their knowledge, attitudes, and skills are their sole possessions. Rather, what is characteristic is that there are the syntheses of these various elements and of the objectives (already discussed) which these other components are intended to further.

This assumes that within different countries there are distinguishable cadres of persons known as "social workers"—or by some other characteristic title. This assumes too something which, from the United Nations' interest in social work training, seems wholly valid, namely, that to do what any given country regards as social work requires special training. In fact, the meeting of the United Nations Social Commission in Geneva in April, 1951, is reported to have resulted in agreement on the principle that "social work must be performed by professional personnel, trained for their task by theoretical and practical studies."² The nature of training and of the knowledge and skills taught in different countries varies widely, of course, from country to country. Nevertheless, it would appear reasonably safe to say that, in varying degrees, the knowledge to be transmitted includes an understanding of people (at least as individuals), of requirements essential to their well-being, of measures and resources available within the country to fulfill these requirements, of methods for ascertaining the particular needs of individuals and groups served, of devices for securing the facts essential to the provision of service, of methods for helping individuals and groups to face the problems to be solved, of how to work with people, and how to help them reach their objectives.

Attitudes required of social workers in different countries will, of course, vary from nation to nation depending upon the value system of each. However, it would appear that the objectives which, as already suggested, social work in different countries seems to have in common would appear to require on the part of social workers such attitudes as caring for people, being accepting of people (accepting

² "Achievements of Social Commission Reviewed," *United Nations Bulletin*, X (May 1, 1951), 435.

them both for what they are and where they are), being able to serve them without condescension and without either special favors or discrimination against them—for how else could social services be administered as the “rights” specified in the United Nations Declaration and how else could the average man in almost any country be helped to help himself?

Notwithstanding many differences in their socioeconomic structure and in their mores, social work as practiced in various countries appears to be built upon a philosophical base which (as suggested earlier) may truly be said to constitute an important element in the common core. In the words of a social work leader from Italy, “Many basic concepts of a philosophical nature as to the aim of social work are applicable to all countries, even to those where different conditions prevail.” Similar observations have been made by many social workers who have crossed and recrossed national lines. For example, Dr. René Sand, beloved and eminent honorary president of the International Conference of Social Work, once said that while social work is different in different countries, different in the circumstances in which it functions, it is not different “in its principles,” and not different “in the basic matter.”

What, then, are these philosophical concepts which might be regarded as comprising, in part, the common core of social work in different countries. In the words of one visitor from the Netherlands who believed that social work in different countries was indeed based upon a common philosophy, the essential elements of this philosophy consist of “a belief in the dignity of a person in a free society, agreement upon what are the common human needs, and the concern of people for their own neighborhoods and about helping to meet the need in the best way.”

With no little trepidation, with frank acknowledgment that all these principles may not be accepted by social workers in any one country, and that implementation of the principles in practice will vary widely from country to country, and as between one service and another and one place and another even within a given country, I risk suggesting the following principles (some of which are derived from declarations of international bodies such as the UNRRA Council and various United Nations instrumentalities,

and others of which are gleaned from social workers and social work literature of various countries) as constituting part of the common core:

1. The well-being of society is dependent upon the recognition, preservation, and enhancement of the intrinsic worth of individuals; the well-being of individuals is dependent upon the level of well-being prevailing in the immediate community and in the larger society of which it is a part.

2. Well-being is dependent upon an individual's relationships both with himself, his family, and other human beings and groups.

3. A reasonable (as measured by prevailing standards) share of material and community services is essential to family, group, and community welfare and to the fostering of individual and group initiative and enterprise.

4. Every individual, group, and community should have fair opportunity in a manner which preserves human dignity and self-respect, and in accord with democratic ideals, to attain the highest attainable level of well-being.

5. The well-being of particular persons and groups in a community is a concern of the whole community and the well-being of communities, the concern of larger social wholes.

6. Prevention of social ills is preferable to mere amelioration; constructive and positive promotion of well-being is preferable to prevention alone.

7. Individuals, groups, and communities unable to provide them for themselves have rights to the goods and services essential to their well-being.

8. Individuals, groups, and communities (normally) can best be helped to advance their own welfare if assistance to them is provided in a manner which preserves their dignity, fosters their strengths, and, so far as not inimical to their own good and that of larger social groupings, reserves to them the responsibility for control over their own affairs.

9. To the extent that government, more effectively than families and broader voluntary associations, can supply services essential to social well-being, it is its responsibility to do so.

10. Early life experience and especially early family life exert a

profound effect upon the development of individuals and groups, thus emphasizing the importance of bringing, as early as possible, constructive influences to bear upon them.

11. Individuals are motivated in part by unconscious influences and by external circumstances beyond their control and, consequently, may not be wholly responsible for their own actions or the situations in which they find themselves.

Many of these principles, obviously, naturally follow from what was earlier said about the nature of social work's objectives, and the knowledge, attitudes, and skills thought to be required for its successful performance.

Social work in different countries, obviously, has in common much more than its core. There are, for example, similarities in the auspices—governmental and voluntary, national and local—under which social work is administered, similarities in the limitations (of the human will, of economic resources, of law) under which it operates, and similarities in its relationship to other disciplines. These factors, however, represent not the “insides” of the giants but their hats and houses, and their external relationships and trappings. The insides of the giants—assuming, of course, that the giants themselves exist—appear to the present writer at least to consist rather of the characteristic synthesis of the philosophy, knowledge, attitudes, skills, and objectives of the members of that discipline which in different countries is responsible primarily for assisting entire societies, communities, groups, and individuals to attain for themselves the highest possible level of well-being but which, when necessary, is responsible also for supplying (directly or indirectly) the goods and services essential to the welfare of individuals, groups, communities, and entire nations.

The Human Aspects of Mobilization

By FRANK P. GRAHAM

THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF SOCIAL WORK stands for emphasis on the meaning of the freedom and dignity of human beings and the responsibility of human society for the equal opportunity and well-being of all people. It is a special responsibility of the Conference to see that the defense program be not only a defense against potential external aggression but also a defense of the humane heritage now imperiled in the world. We must all sacrifice comforts and luxuries but we must all be on guard against the sacrifice of the education, health, and sound well-being of the people and the equal chance of all children, whose humane heritage, opportunities, and hopes are what the mobilization in the long run is committed to against the totalitarian tyranny which would destroy them.

With all our rightfully deep concern over critical materials, priorities, stock-piling, strategic shortages, and bottlenecks, our deepest concern is with manpower, with human beings above all. Before all and after all, human beings are what the defense mobilization is all about. Human beings, their valor and skills, their freedom and hopes, constitute our military, industrial, and moral power in the front lines in Korea and in the production lines in America. Upon the long-sustained mobilization of human beings for defense and for production depends the freedom of America and the peace of the world.

Since the President, the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, the Secretary of Labor, and the American people have long been committed to the voluntary utilization of manpower for the gigantic program of military and civilian production, we must have a well-prepared, clearly directed, and wisely coordinated program in the localities, the states, and the regions throughout the nation. Human beings are not cold figures on a page, which can be arbitrarily moved about at will. The statistics in our tables repre-

sent flesh-and-blood people with homes, families, children, churches, schools, with attachments, traditions, and rootages deep in the local communities in which they live and love, work and worship, sacrifice and hope. Through voluntary procedures, statistics do not remain cold figures on a page but become persons of freedom and power. The free labor of the democracies can outlast and outproduce the slave labor of the dictators.

The Defense Manpower Administration requires the guidance, the organization, the plans and programs, which seek to meet the manpower requirements by the voluntary ways of information, training, understanding, and leadership of free men in a free society. From the high morale of a free people, intelligently and fairly guided, will come the unbreakable will to make the sacrifices and do the work which will produce the military and moral power necessary to save freedom and organize peace in the world.

The Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, Charles E. Wilson, on April 10, 1951, said to the country:

When the President asked me to undertake this task, he outlined a single and wholly patriotic goal: to mobilize our strength for defense—to mobilize it in the shortest possible time—to mobilize it with the least possible danger to our economy—and to mobilize it with no impairment of our freedoms, and with the least possible impairment of our standard of living.

The United States Department of Labor, itself not a claimant of labor except in the sense that any government department or agency is, is in its responsibilities, under the law, a public service agency for other government agencies and the people of America in accordance with the federal-state structure of the American system. The Defense Manpower Administration is not a claimant for manpower but an operating service agency for the claimants of civilian manpower. The four claimants of manpower are: (1) private business and industry; (2) agriculture; (3) the local, state, and federal governments; and (4) selective service and the armed services. The main responsibility of the Defense Manpower Administration is the operation of the civilian manpower program.

A summary of their responsibilities, organization, problems, and goals is as follows:

1. The general responsibility, organization, relations, and functions of the Defense Manpower Administration, as an essential operating arm of the Department of Labor in its responsibility for the prompt recruitment, efficient placement, best use, skilled training, and sound protection of civilian manpower for optimum production

2. The present temporary nature of local and sporadic layoffs as characteristic parts of the manpower problem and the coming heavy impacts of defense production in the summer and fall of 1951

3. The manpower requirements both of defense production and of the maintenance of the well-being of the people

4. The sources of manpower for meeting these requirements, and the complex and never ending job of getting the right number of the right people at the right place at the right time under the right conditions

5. The long-run purposes and values of the sustained mobilization and best utilization of the required manpower of the nation for the defense of freedom and the establishment of peace in the world

6. A summary of the goals for the mobilization of manpower

The responsibility of the Defense Manpower Administration for the operation of the civilian manpower program is based on: (1) Secretary of Labor Maurice Tobin's General Order 48, issued September 29, 1950, which established the Office of Defense Manpower, set up its organization, the Management-Labor Advisory Committee on Defense Manpower, the Interdepartmental Committee on Defense Manpower, and the Women's Advisory Committee on Defense Manpower, and defined the defense functions of the six bureaus; (2) Amendment No. 1 to General Order 48, issued March 10, 1951, which established the Defense Manpower Administration and the thirteen regional offices with their management-labor and interagency committees.

Both the long-run responsibility and the definite function of the Defense Manpower Administration in the present national and world situation can be seen in the larger context of the responsibility of the United Nations for the freedom and peace of the world; in the mounting power of the United States as the chief bulwark

of the free nations in the United Nations; in the Office of Defense Mobilization as the policy-coordinating agency for building the might of the United States; and in the Defense Manpower Administration as the Department of Labor's right arm for the operation of the civilian manpower program for the goals set by the Office of Defense Mobilization.

To coordinate the manpower policies of the nation, the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, under large powers delegated to him by the President, has set up a committee composed of the representatives of the Departments of Defense, Agriculture, and Labor, the Federal Security Agency, the Civil Service Commission, the Selective Service System, and the Defense Production Administration, with the representative of the Office of Defense Mobilization as chairman. A National Management-Labor Committee, along the lines set up by the Secretary of Labor in 1950, has been envisaged under the co-chairmanship of the representative of the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization and the representative of the Secretary of Labor.

Labor and management have the largest functional interest in manpower policies and operations. The policies and operations cannot be separated by absolute compartments. The responsibility of the Office of Defense Mobilization for coordination of inter-agency policies and the responsibility of the Department of Labor for operations of the civilian manpower program can be integrated in the National Management-Labor Committee, under the co-chairmanship of the representative of the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization and the representative of the Secretary of Labor.

The Office of Defense Mobilization has the over-all responsibility for manpower policies and their coordination. The Department of Labor is responsible for the operation of approximately 85 percent of the civilian manpower program and has interagency working agreements for sharing in the coordination of the remaining 15 percent. If adequately equipped with budget and organization, this concentration of responsibility for operations can avoid uneconomical and inefficient duplication of manpower operations by other agencies of the government.

The central structure of the Defense Manpower Administration heads up in the office of the Administrator, an executive director, his deputy, and three specialists. The plans and programs under the central office of the Defense Manpower Administration are developed and operated by the six bureaus and the thirteen regional offices with their interagency and management-labor committees. The regional offices work in cooperation with other federal agencies, the state agencies, and the areas offices, advised by their own local interagency committees and their own management-labor committees. They all work cooperatively on such manpower problems as recruitment and placement; improving old skills and training new skills; shifts from nondefense to defense production; protecting labor standards; preventing accidents; reducing absenteeism and turnover; providing information and statistical analysis regarding labor market, present needs and trends, rights of veterans, opportunities for women and minorities, housing, transportation, utilities, schools, recreation, child care centers, and scores of other human, economic, and social factors vital to labor, management, and production.

The job of getting the right number of the right people to the right place, at the right job, at the right time, and under the right conditions, is at best complex, ever changing, and never ending. The six bureaus in the Defense Manpower Administration—the Bureaus of Employment Security, Labor Statistics, Labor Standards, Apprentice Training, Veterans' Reemployment Rights, and the Women's Bureau—work cooperatively and everlastingly at the job in the regions and in the localities in cooperation with the state agencies. The task is made more difficult by the fact that the defense program is superimposed on the highest civilian production and the largest working force in the history of this country. In addition, there has been no Pearl Harbor and no declaration of war against a major power to provide the all-out drive of total war.

Our immediate objectives are:

1. To get the immediate necessary training programs underway
2. To build a field organization and to develop leadership in the regions
3. To protect workers against accidents

4. To provide adequate labor market and manpower statistical information
5. To provide additional staff for farm placement activity
6. To provide liaison with national employers on labor supply problems
7. To make a study of reemployment rights for civilian workers
8. To plan for the larger program whose heavy impact will come in the fall of 1951
9. To provide administrative services for the Office of the Secretary

It is clear that all the Department of Labor's regular programs—(a) operation of the public employment system; (b) apprentice training, training new skills, improving old skills, and increasing production; (c) prevention of accidents, absenteeism, and turnover; (d) recruitment and placement of women, the minority groups, the handicapped, veterans, older people, agricultural workers, and foreign groups; (e) provision of labor market information; and (f) statistical analyses of the cost of living and of wages, the assembling of data, surveys, and reports for industry, labor, government, and the public—are even more urgently essential during defense mobilization than in peacetime.

The defense mobilization of manpower requires the expansion of old programs and the inauguration of new programs. Provisions for the over-all leadership and planning and for coordination and operation of the civilian manpower programs are requested in this supplemental budget. In other words, we are in the administrative, planning, designing, engineering, and tooling-up period of civilian manpower mobilization for defense production.

The Defense Manpower Administration has outlined a program for dealing with this problem:

1. We need to build a strong, flexible field organization which will be capable of providing leadership to the state and local organizations which must do the actual work of recruitment and placement. Of course, our cooperating state and local employment services are operating now and have been operating all along on an efficient basis. This new job, however, will require vastly more labor and management cooperation than has been necessary in nor-

mal times. Our regional area labor-management committees are designed to bring about the best possible relationship between the operating government agencies and the general public which they are designed to serve.

We need staff to serve as co-chairmen of the regional defense mobilization committees established by the Office of Defense Mobilization to provide machinery for coordination of production and manpower activity; also as chairmen of regional management-labor committees established by the Secretary of Labor in order to secure the assistance of management and labor in developing and executing the defense manpower program. The Defense Manpower Administration has responsibility for servicing the thirteen inter-agency committees in part and for servicing the thirteen management-labor committees in full.

Although the direct responsibility for recruiting and placing workers and gathering labor market information at the state level is carried by the states, it is our responsibility to provide technical guidance to state agencies in developing area interagency committees, area management-labor committees, and area manpower programs and in developing labor market information.

Examples of some of the problems that already exist in a number of communities are: prevention of labor pirating; the development of orderly procedures for shifting workers into defense work; and the prevention of unemployment through securing defense contracts.

2. We must develop an adequate flow of up-to-date information, both nationally and locally, so that we can foresee the size and nature of the manpower problem and also so that the local offices, local businessmen, and local labor will know what they have to do and how well they are doing it. The more information that can be made available to our operating agencies and to employers and workers, the more chance there will be for an effective meeting of our manpower needs.

3. We need to conserve and expand certain types of skills which we know are going to be critically short and which will require extraordinary effort to find. Additional training programs are necessary to provide more skilled workers, as well as more short-run,

on-the-job training. The actual operation of such training is partly a problem for management and partly for labor itself through apprenticeship and on-the-job training, but the assistance of government will be required. It is to provide such assistance that we are asking funds for the Defense Manpower Administration.

4. Improving the use of the existing labor force is one effective means of expanding our productive capacity. One way of doing this is to prevent some of the accidents that occur every day in our factories and work places. In one year, injuries to men and women at work cause a total of 700,000 manyears of lost time. If an accident is prevented, a trained and experienced person has been kept on the job.

5. The most efficient use of the labor force can be obtained by putting the work where the worker is rather than shifting the worker and his family to a new place. Some shipping will be absolutely unavoidable, and our employment offices will do everything in their power to bring it about where it is needed. However, we here at headquarters can bring the facts to bear with other government agencies for the purpose of working out the best possible placement of contracts in relation to available local labor supplies.

6. The entire manpower program is designed to operate by voluntary methods. Therefore, everything possible should be done to facilitate such voluntary action so as to produce the highest possible degree of guided mobility in the labor force. In some respects, the problem is much more difficult than it was in the Second World War. Not only do we not have any reserve of unemployment on which to draw, but workers have many rights in their jobs which make them reluctant to shift from one industry to another, from one firm to another, from one place to another. These are the seniority rights which they have through union agreements and the vast multitude of health, welfare, and benefit plans which offer advantages to the worker who stays with his present employer.

7. Continuous planning and flexibility of program will be essential in the next two years. The type of economic and manpower analyses which I am presenting must be kept up continuously in order to guide our operating agencies. For example, we can never know whether the present program will continue at the present

scale to the achievement of the goal foreseen by the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, or whether, in midstream, an entirely new program may have to be instituted almost overnight. At the national headquarters we must be able to shift our manpower programs quickly and effectively in the light of any sudden developments and changed requirements in meeting the impact of the mobilization program.

The sources of additional potential manpower are:

1. Labor shifts from nondefense to defense production
2. The unemployed, who now number 1,700,000 compared with 8,000,000 on the eve of the Second World War
3. Youth becoming of age at the rate of 900,000 a year
4. Minority groups now discriminated against on account of color, race, creed, or national origin
5. Increased population due to the high birth rate accompanying prosperity, as compared with the low birth rate in the period of depression preceding the Second World War
6. Handicapped people, who have been found to be 2 percent more productive than nonhandicapped people
7. Older workers whose efficiency is unimpaired
8. Foreign workers

We know that there must be no relaxation in the mobilization of manpower for "building America's might." We must not blow hot and cold; be on again, off again; up and down in our program either for defense training or defense production. Any relaxation of America's mobilization is an invitation to the totalitarian dictatorship for the subjugation of the world. The United States of America must become stronger in military, naval, air, atomic, scientific, industrial, agricultural, financial, democratic, and moral power. Close to the center of the main responsibility and chief hope of our time is the mobilization of American manpower for the production and the defense in behalf of the freedom and peace of the peoples of the earth.

American manpower, in the armed forces and in both defense and civilian production, has the following goals:

1. To prevent a third world war if possible—and we believe it is possible.

2. To win the war in Korea and a third world war if it should come—and we pray it will not come.
3. To lick inflation, as a threat to our freedom and our power. In addition to control of credit, prices, and wages; in addition to higher taxation; in addition to economy in government; we need maximum production as a bulwark against a spiraling inflation.
4. To aid our allies of the free world against the monstrous threats of totalitarian tyranny which would lock all peoples behind the Iron Curtain hanging over the prison walls of the police state.
5. To maintain a high level of civilian production for the economic, social, and spiritual well-being of our own people.
6. To be the bulwark of a stronger United Nations as the chief hope of freedom, justice, and peace on earth.

The Response of Social Work to the Present Challenge

By JOSEPH P. ANDERSON

TO MANY SOCIAL WORKERS the challenge of the present day is not very clear. It may be appropriate, therefore, to review some of the elements in the present national and world situation which contribute to the challenge which we are facing. We are living in a period of history that finds most of us confused, uncertain, and fearful of the future. We are confused because we know we are living in a period when our social, political, and economic institutions are in process of change. Some of us resist change and cling wistfully to the hope that we will return to the "good old days." We are reluctant to part with our traditional concepts and theories and we shrink from facing the future realistically because we know that it means that life will be different from what we have known heretofore.

In addition to being confused and uncertain because of the rapid changes which are occurring, we are fearful. We are afraid that someone will get ahead of us. We are afraid of unemployment and depressions and we are fearful of the destructive power of atomic energy. We have fears that lead to apathy, to the "what's the use" attitude; we have fears that lead to hate, and fears that lead to war. These are the fears that aggravate our confusion and increase tension and anxiety. These fears contribute to the hysteria that now prevails.

There are things that we should fear and we should save our fear for those places where it is needed. We should fear people who push other people around; we should fear intolerance; we should fear ignorance and injustice. We should remember that blind fears can lead to disaster. Intelligent fears can keep us aware of the threats to our democratic society.

This unwillingness to accept change and the fears that have been mentioned are negative elements in the world of today, but there are also some positive developments. The first of these is a very strong desire on the part of people all over the world for peace, security, and a high standard of living. The second is the recognition that all men and all nations throughout the world are interdependent, and that if we are to achieve the objectives of peace, security, and a higher standard of living, it will take joint planning and concerted international action. The third positive development is one that someone has called the "resurgence of the grass root spirit," and by that is meant the movement among ordinary citizens, not only in this country, but all over the world, to claim a new status and to demand the right of greater participation in our society. There is also recognition that if we are to solve the social and economic problems which we face today, we must give attention to means other than simply those of force, and dollars, and the production of goods.

As Raymond Fosdick recently said, "What has broken down is not so much an intricate economic mechanism as it is man's confidence in himself and in his fellow man." What has been bombed out and dissipated is not primarily a smoothly running system for the production of consumer goods, but rather hope and faith and the belief that the individual in all his misery and magnificence is the final criterion of worth. We have been witnessing a growing recognition that our most fundamental need is a deep conviction of the worth and dignity and creative capacity of human beings and a confidence in man's ability to solve his problems cooperatively with his fellow man.

Finally, there is a growing conviction that we need to reaffirm our faith in the fundamental values on which has been based all that is worth while in our society. We need to revitalize our conviction that that society is best which gives the greatest practical recognition to the dignity of individual man, and which affords greatest opportunities for the development of the higher potentialities of all men. We need to devote our whole intelligence and greatest efforts to the task of devising ways and means whereby those essential values can be given their most complete expression.

We must recognize that we are living in a world of flux and change and we must be alive and alert to the problems of a shaken world. It is because of these positive developments, and particularly the last, that there is hope for the future. If we examine our fears realistically and accept them for what they are, and build on these positive developments, we can move forward to find the solution for the perplexing social and economic problems we face and move toward building a healthy world order.

The social and economic problems with which we must deal can be classified first as those that we have to face as a result of the impact of defense mobilization in this country, and second, as those we must work out together with other countries in competing the task of world reconstruction and rehabilitation. Under the second heading we have a continuing responsibility for helping to provide the goods and services to keep people from starving, and to heal the physical and emotional scars which a war leaves. Help must be provided for millions of persons to enable them to reestablish social order, to renew their cultures, and, in many instances, to build a completely new way of life. We must complete the job of finding permanent settlement for the thousands of displaced persons who are still living in the camps of Europe. We must also provide the special services for the vulnerable groups in all countries, the very young, the very old, to youth, to the physically and emotionally handicapped. These services must be provided in all countries if we are to achieve a stable and orderly world.

The problems that we face in this country stem from the long-range social and economic developments which have and are affecting our lives, the effects of the last war, and the impact of the current program of defense mobilization. A part of the challenge of the present day is that we have not as yet worked out a plan to provide the security and services that our aging population needs. We have not as yet worked out an adequate income maintenance program, neither have we given sufficient attention to the planning and organization and direction of the necessary health, education, recreation, and special social services which an aging population requires. We have not found solutions for many social and economic problems which necessarily accompany the technological

advance in the change from an agrarian society to a highly industrialized urban society. These problems which have stemmed from these long-range developments were accentuated during the last war and now are being intensified as a result of the present emergency.

And what is more, something new is being added. The challenge of the present day for social work is that defense mobilization is creating serious problems for the individual, the family, and the community. There will be dislocation of family life as men are called to military service or take jobs in defense industry. There will be dislocation of community life when defense activities bring in thousands of new persons almost overnight. The stresses and strains that are created by the impact of this defense mobilization program, and the social problems which people have to face, are going to cause individual breakdown and will endanger healthy family and community life. The youth of this country, of whom so much is expected, feels the impact of this current emergency more than the other groups. The challenge to social work, it seems to me, is to do its share in seeing that the current trying experiences which youth must undergo do not result in permanent harm. We must recognize that youth, which at the moment is the most vulnerable, is also our greatest potential. In short, the challenge to social work is how can we maintain our ongoing services and at the same time plan and organize and administer the additional services that are needed?

There are four special areas where social work has an important role to play in meeting the present challenge. The first is in helping to provide the necessary social services to our armed forces. The second is in strengthening and improving our selective service system. The third is in helping to plan, organize, and administer the social services which must be provided in the new communities created through defense mobilization activities. The fourth is in helping to plan and administer our civil defense program.

The challenge for social work today is also related to the attacks which are now being made on the philosophy and principles on which our public social welfare programs are based. The experience of the last war in this country and abroad emphasizes the im-

portance of maintaining and expanding social services to military and civilian personnel. The drafting of husbands and fathers into the armed forces, the entry of women and young people into war industries, migration of families to new and congested areas, and establishment of camps and military centers in our communities brought with them emotional and financial stress on individual and family life. There was an intensification of problems of unsupervised children, juvenile delinquency, illegitimacy, physical and mental illness. These developments brought about wide community interest in the establishment of the necessary help and social services. There is now evidence, however, that this experience is being ignored. It is being stated that if this nation is to devote a large part of its human and material resources to defense mobilization, it must retrench in the expenditures of public and private funds for the maintenance of social welfare programs. The emphasis on defense mobilization is now being used as a basis for undermining the sound humane policies governing administration of our social welfare programs. We have noted with increasing concern official actions in several states and in Congress leading to the release of confidential information about recipients of public assistance to the public, proposals to restrict eligibility for assistance in cases of illegitimacy, and recommendations to limit the general coverage and adequacy of assistance. We are aware also that in some places people are forgetting that social workers are citizens too, and as such are entitled to all the rights and freedoms that are clearly set forth in our Constitution. When attacks on programs of public welfare fail, those who would destroy our social welfare structure make a personal attack on the social worker. This, then, is the challenge. A natural response would be, "This is where we came in." The reaction, though understandable, would not be valid. The situation which we face is different, and social work today is different. The situation is serious because the forces that would undermine, and if possible destroy, the social welfare structure in this country are powerful and cunning, and we should recognize that they will use consciously the fears which too many of us possess to achieve their selfish aims.

There is something different about social work today. We have

gone through a depression and two wars and we have demonstrated conclusively that our objectives, our principles, and the services which we offer make a major contribution to strengthening our democratic society. The response of social work to the present-day challenge will also be different. In responding to the challenge, social work is saying first of all that it is unequivocally committed to the maintenance of peace. By its philosophy and professional disciplines, social work is inherently a constructive pursuit sensitive to the needs of the individual, and working for the development of a community life which secures for all persons opportunities to achieve maximum productivity, security, and an increasingly higher standard of living. For this reason social workers share with persons in other fields of endeavor a deep conviction that it is of the greatest importance that every means should be utilized to prevent war.

We believe that the experience of the last decade demonstrates conclusively that countries, like men, are interdependent and that if we are to achieve peace, security, and a high standard of living for all people, the nations of the world must work cooperatively to eliminate those problems and conditions which endanger peace and lead to war.

We recognize, however, that the world is now facing a threat of continuing armed conflict among nations and increasing emphasis on mobilization of this country's resources for a program of defense. We believe that this development has grave implications for the social services in this country and should be viewed realistically by all persons concerned with the maintenance and strengthening of our social welfare structure.

Social work's response to the present challenge is that it will accept and discharge its responsibilities in this kind of world in keeping with its objectives and philosophy and with full utilization of its knowledge and skill. Especially in times like these, social work emphasizes that the social and economic problems we face are human problems, and that all problems start with the individual. Social work further points out that the problems of the nation and the problems of the world are just problems of the individual multiplied a thousandfold.

The objectives of social work, stated simply, are, first, to make it possible for every individual to have the most productive life of which he is capable. To achieve this objective the profession of social work seeks to create special services for individuals and families whose needs are not being met. Secondly, social work seeks to modify or reshape social and economic institutions which are failing to fulfill their functions. In attempting to reshape institutions, social work uses the experience which it has gained in the creation of special services to individuals and families who are in need of them.

The philosophy of social work has been outlined many times, most recently by Kenneth Pray who, until his death, was Dean of the School of Social Work at the University of Pennsylvania. At a meeting of the National Conference of Social Work in San Francisco, in 1947, he stated:

The philosophy of social work. . . rests upon a profound faith in human beings, in their inherent and inviolable right to choose and to achieve their own destiny, through social relations of their own making, within the essential framework of a stable and progressive society. It rests upon a deep appreciation of the validity and the value to society as a whole of these individual differences in human beings. It conceives of social unity and progress as the outcome of the integration, not the suppression or conquest, of these differences. Accordingly, it tests all social arrangements and institutions by their impact upon individual lives, by their capacity to utilize for the common good the unique potentialities of individual human beings, through relationships that enlist their active and productive participation. It is, in short, a genuinely and consistently democratic philosophy.¹

Social work utilizes the knowledge from the related disciplines of sociology, psychology, economics, anthropology, and political science. Social work has knowledge of the make-up of communities—the factors which contribute to sound community life. Social work has knowledge of social, political, and economic institutions. It is in position to see how these institutions are serving the people or are failing to do so. Social work has knowledge of community resources available to people in need of them and ways of utilizing

¹ Kenneth L. M. Pray, "When Is Community Organization Social Work Practice?" *Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work, 1947* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1948), pp. 196-97.

these resources. Social work has knowledge of government structure and the laws which affect the individual. Social work has knowledge of social agency structure, program procedures, and interagency relationships.

Social work has knowledge of the cultural factors which affect an individual's opportunities. Social work has knowledge of methods of working with individuals and groups and communities. Social work also has knowledge about people, their needs, hopes, and aspirations; how they feel in times of stress, their fears and anxieties; knowledge that except in unusual circumstances most individuals want to and are competent to manage their affairs, even during periods of great stress. Social work has knowledge of the effect on personality of social disabilities and social maladjustments like those created by unemployment, low wages, or inadequate housing. We know what these conditions do to people as few others do. We know it in the same way that doctors know the effect of a contaminated water supply.

Social work has knowledge in the area of social organization. We know how to get people to work together for the benefit of the community, how to organize social services under public and private auspices. We have a wide experience in types of organization, the effect upon services of the auspices under which they are performed, and the way to coordinate complex social problems.

In offering a professional service social work has developed certain skills. Social work utilizes the skill of fact-finding, investigation, collection, analysis, and interpretation of data. Social work utilizes the skill of establishing an intimate, and at the same time objective, relationship in giving individuals and families the assistance which they need. Social work utilizes the skill of promoting constructive social relationships, of making the most effective use of resources in the community. Social work has developed skill in dispensing financial aid. Social work utilizes skill in the use of legal authority for constructive purposes. We have also perfected tools. The tools most generally used in the practice of social work are interviewing, counseling, group discussion, recording, and community interpretation.

Social work makes its contribution to the solution of our social

and economic problems by helping to formulate public social policies, legislative and administrative. Social work has made this contribution by first offering convincing testimony as to the extent and seriousness of the needs of people; second, by insisting that individuals are competent to manage their affairs and urging that this independence and self-reliance be preserved; third, by pointing out that people in distress feel threatened, and by urging the adoption of safeguards to minimize these threats. Social work also makes a contribution in the planning, organization, and administration of programs of service. Social work has competence in the area of social organization. We know how to get people to work together for the benefit of the community, how to organize social services under public and private auspices. In learning how to use community resources in helping people we serve, social work has learned to synthesize concepts and skills of other professions—education, health, finance. This too is a contribution social work can make.

In responding to the challenge of today, social work is saying that the quality of service it offers in the last analysis, depends on the caliber of the people who are employed to administer the services. For that reason, social work must be concerned with the recruitment and education and placement of social workers. Because social service is provided through the instrumentality of an agency, social work must also be concerned about good personnel practices. We are saying that the quality of social service can be affected by the conditions under which social workers are required to perform their duties, and we are saying also that if we are to recruit enough people to man these expanding programs, we are going to have to do a better job in finding money to pay more adequate salaries.

Social work is better prepared to deal with the challenge of today because of two significant projects which have been completed in 1951. The first is the study of social work education, and the second is the study of salaries and working conditions in social work. These two studies are significant milestones in our efforts to further the responsible and progressive development of the profession. Social work is saying also that we must do a more effective job of planning and coordination if we are to make our optimum contribution to

meet the needs of today. In this we will need the wholehearted support and cooperation, not only of all professional workers, but also of our lay colleagues. We believe that the impact of defense mobilization will bring about new conditions and new needs, and that as these arise, they provide an opportunity for the development of new approaches and new organizational patterns in offering social services. The effectiveness and efficiency of such programs will depend on sound planning, qualified personnel, adequate financing, and wholehearted citizen support.

The response of social work to the present challenge must also take into account the attacks which are now being made on the philosophy and principles on which our public and private social welfare programs are based. These attacks stem, in part, from the fears that people have. Too many people have reached the conclusion that there are only two choices before us: One is that we must have a society which offers security with no freedom, such as the totalitarian states offer. The other choice is to have freedom but little security, and that is what people say democracy offers. Social workers say that there is another choice, which is that we have a democratic society where government can assume responsibility for human welfare—a society where we can preserve freedom and personal initiative and a democratic way of life and still have the government discharge responsibility in helping to meet the health and welfare needs of all the people.

In responding to the challenge of today, social work reaffirms its belief in four basic concepts. The first is the concept regarding the role of government in helping to meet the health and welfare needs of our citizens. We now think of the role of government in positive terms. There is an increasing acceptance of the fact that it is an appropriate responsibility of government at the federal, state, and local level to provide services which will promote the well-being of all the people.

The story of the development of public social services in this country is the story of a people learning to use its government to meet the needs and to protect against hazards that have come increasingly to threaten the well-being of individuals and of society. Government has been recognized as the only organized unit of our

society that is large enough to deal with major hazards affecting all the people. The problem has always been to maintain a situation in which it is the people who use the government and not to create a situation in which the government can control and use the people.

The second significant concept of our time is that there should be a minimum level, a floor of health, welfare, and educational services, below which no one in this country should be permitted to fall. In a country as wealthy as the United States we are able and can provide the necessary services and benefits to facilitate or supplement the activities of an individual in his own behalf.

The third concept is that of universality. We no longer identify social programs with a particular group. We believe they should be available to everybody.

The fourth concept concerns the nature and source of personal initiative, and this is one around which there is the greatest concern and the greatest confusion. In the depression of the thirties, we social workers learned that the unemployed person who was obliged to secure assistance was no different from other people, except for his desperate situation. He had the same problems and the same strengths; he was in need, not of moral reform, but of opportunity. We know that what human beings want is a chance to make the most of themselves, and that an improved environment can discover unsuspected resources in people. We have learned that economic security and hope are greater feeders of enterprise than inadequacies, suffering, and fear. We know too that the respect one person feels for another person influences his feeling of respect for himself, and that his sense of self-respect influences his capacity to do and to act.

And while we are considering this concept, it may be well for us just to think briefly about some of the changes which have occurred in this country during the last century. The most important, of course, is that we have changed from a primarily agricultural society to one that is primarily an industrialized and urban society. We used to get our security from the land and what it produced but we now live in a world of mills and factories and crowded cities, and yet we are hamstrung by the traditions of an agricultural civilization which is gone. Today there are 11,000,000 aged, orphaned,

blind, sick, and unemployed who, with minor exceptions, are not earning, even in the postwar and defense good times, enough to meet the merciless costs of rent, food, utilities, and clothing. They cannot turn to a beneficent free land for the money wages which alone will obtain essential food, clothing, and shelter. Yet we think and talk of how any man can make a living, that only the shiftless and the lazy will accept aid, and that everyone should save for a rainy day. Many of our representatives in our legislatures and in our Congress legislate for the aged and the disabled and the sick and the unemployed as though they still lived and worked in the 1800s. The security of most of us no longer rests in the land and what it will produce. It rests on the unstable and unpredictable opportunity we have to get and hold a job. The average individual can no longer turn to his savings or his parents, brothers or sisters, or children to see him through a long illness and rehabilitation. That is why we say that there is a role for government in helping to protect against these hazards.

With the acceptance of these concepts has come the development of broad social policy and the provision by government of a comprehensive system of social security. There is evidence on every hand that the problem of how to extend economic security without curtailing the traditional rights of free men dominates the national and the international political picture.

Basic to the concept of social security are certain convictions about the nature and motivation of men, and the source and method of dealing with the hazards which threaten all men in our society. These convictions which give direction to the solution which social security offers are:

1. That men by and large can manage their own affairs and will want to take part in the productive activities of the community unless they are prevented from doing so by forces beyond their control
2. That in such a society as ours certain hazards exist to which all men are potentially subjected; these hazards may fall with crushing weight on any one individual, but if the risk is shared by society as a whole the destructive economic effect on individuals can be mitigated

3. That society as a whole cannot be healthy if any significant proportion of the population is not healthy, and that a democratic society cannot maintain itself and preserve the freedom of its people if any large proportion of the population is economically, socially, or politically incapacitated

4. That the assurance of basic minimum essentials of living to all men will free rather than inhibit the exercise of initiative in the effort to secure an improved standard of living both individual and social

The response of social work to the challenge of today, then, is first that we accept the responsibilities placed upon us, and resolve to do our best to provide the highest standard of service to the persons and communities in need of them; second, that we will plan and organize and administer our programs with the view of developing a flexible network of services to meet our country's changing needs; third, that we reaffirm our belief in the philosophy and the concepts and the principles on which our social welfare programs are based, and we shall resist with vigor and determination the efforts being made to weaken or to destroy them.

The task which faces social work in the years ahead is a difficult one. In approaching this task, however, we should remind ourselves of these important assets: First, we have achieved a greater sense of unity in social work than in any previous period in our history. The organization and program of the National Social Welfare Assembly, the National Council on Social Work Education, and the National Committee on Social Work in Defense Mobilization reflect the determined efforts being made by the social work community in achieving unity. Second, the value of social work is being recognized increasingly. Despite the attacks that are being made on it, social work is being accepted as an integral part of the total program of community services. Third, we have established and are maintaining sound cooperative working relationships with other professions. Fourth, we continue to enjoy the wholehearted support of our lay colleagues and of a large proportion of the citizens of this country.

We approach the future with vision, with courage, with faith, and with humility—humility, because we, the social workers,

know better than anyone else that it will not be possible for us to do everything that will be demanded of us; vision, to see beyond our narrow institutional boundaries and to plan in a bold and far-sighted manner for the nation's needs; courage, to break with traditional patterns of organization, to try new approaches in providing services, and to define the concepts and principles on which social work programs are founded. Finally, we must have faith in the people we serve, in ourselves, and in the democratic society we help to build. This kind of faith founded this nation. It kept it together and molded it when we were a little country. We were a daring people, a reckless people, a determined people, a courageous people—and all of these things we are today. But, no one of them or all together are enough without the simple and essential faith that the concept of democracy, the divine principle of man's sovereignty, cannot long be challenged and in the end must triumph. With this kind of faith we can face a future that we know is going to be filled with storms. I suggest that we join with Carl Sandburg in saying "We know that there are storms that lie ahead, but we know also that clear skies and stars are there to come after."

The Significance of the Study of Social Work Education

By HARRIETT M. BARTLETT

THE STUDY OF SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION made for the National Council on Social Work Education is the culmination of a long series of important events in social work. No one could adequately summarize the report, which must be read as a whole to grasp its full import. I shall give here merely an over-all view. I cannot hope to say all that needs to be said but shall feel satisfied if I can convey some sense of the deeper significance of this study for social work.

In evaluating such a professional study one is concerned not only with its specific findings and recommendations but also with its power to motivate a group toward wise action based on long-range planning. I shall emphasize the broader contributions of the report to our thinking regarding (1) social work as a profession; (2) professional education for social work; and (3) the interdependence of education and practice.

As background for the discussion a brief picture of the content of the report should be given. It is entitled *Social Work Education in the United States*¹ and has been produced through the joint authorship of Ernest V. Hollis, whose field is higher education, and Alice L. Taylor, a social work practitioner and educator. When the Study Committee of the Council was first advised to seek a study director from outside social work there was considerable hesitation, but events have proved the value of such a review of our field at this time. The objectivity of an outside observer has been combined with the knowledge and insight of a member of the profession in such a way as to give us new understanding of our

¹ Ernest V. Hollis and Alice L. Taylor, *Social Work Education in the United States* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1951).

problems, responsibilities, and opportunities in the young and growing profession of social work.

The study is neither a survey of schools nor a curriculum analysis but a comprehensive and penetrating examination of the over-all situation based on tested knowledge and principles from higher education and the other professions. Part I deals with foundations for educational planning, covering the evolution of social work education, the scope and status of social work today, and its expanded future role. Part II is concerned with charting a course for social work education. It begins with a full discussion of the undergraduate college in social work education and of graduate professional education for social work. There follow three chapters on specific aspects, namely, the administration of schools of social work, the educational responsibilities of social work organizations, and accreditation for social work. A concluding section considers the implications for the profession in translating the report into action.

The study presents a comprehensive picture of social work education, as related to social work practice. It is an important milestone in the development of the profession. It faces issues squarely, not evading even those practices and procedures which have been regarded as most sacred by the profession, but in raising questions points toward possible ways for answering them. The study process itself has been of great value. Through conference and consultation the study has involved a large number of persons in examining various facets of social work education and practice. Thus it reflects the thinking of many social workers. Furthermore, the study process has in turn influenced their thinking and has already moved the profession forward constructively in relation to a number of important issues.

In recent years much has been said about the growth of social work toward professional status. The study helps us to face what it really means to become a profession. In order to enable us to judge where we stand in comparison with other professions and in terms of progress toward professional maturity, the report presents certain criteria,² which follow:

² *Ibid.*, pp. 109-10.

1. Does the profession have a well-defined function, the nature and scope of which can be identified?
2. Does the profession have a philosophy, code of ethics, and other means of self-regulation which assure that its practice transcends the bounds of political, sectarian, and economic self-interest?
3. Does the profession have a unified pattern of organizations that can speak for it with one voice?
4. Does the compensation received by the professional practitioner indicate that the public is willing to pay him as a skilled and responsible professional worker?
5. Is the practice of the profession limited, or tending to be limited, to persons with approved general and professional preparation?
6. Is there, in fact, a recognized systematic body of knowledge, skills, and attitudes which can be identified and transmitted as a regimen of professional preparation?
7. Is the regimen of professional education recognized as of a quality appropriate for inclusion in the graduate and professional offerings of a university?

It will be recognized from these criteria that only the hard core of social work in the United States can be said to have attained professional status. We stand better in relation to some than to others, but our progress toward these goals has been and still is very uneven.

Perhaps the most important point, which is brought out repeatedly through the study, is the need to define the goals of social work, the nature of its service, and the results it hopes to achieve. On the basis of the above criteria for a profession, society can hardly be expected to delegate important responsibilities to a group which is so diffuse in its thinking and purposes as is social work today. Furthermore, an educational curriculum cannot be strongly and soundly developed until a profession has attained a certain degree of clarity and consensus in relation to its objectives, its functions, and the essential nature of its competencies. Until this stage has been reached, the knowledge, skills, and philosophy to be taught cannot be accurately defined.

A further important principle stressed by the study is that education for social work is the responsibility of the whole profession. In the past we have permitted schools to carry the major burden of developing and financing the educational program, with limited interest and support from other groups in practice. The report shows convincingly that the support of social work education rests squarely on all segments of the profession, including the functional and professional organizations and employing agencies, equally with the schools.

It is obvious that further progress also rests upon the attainment of a unified profession, with some central structure and organization through which the various activities and interests relating to professional education and other functions can be effectively integrated. Movement has already taken place toward such a structure in education through the National Council on Social Work Education. This is a direct and encouraging result of the study process.

From these points it can be seen that the study exposes the social work profession to a disciplined appraisal, greatly needed at this time, as to where it stands in relation to other professions and higher education, also in terms of its progress toward maturity and responsibility to society.

The report rests on the basic concept that "education for professional responsibility is a continuous process which begins in the undergraduate college, is followed by study in a graduate professional school, and is continued after graduation through organized professional association with colleagues."³ In social work we have been building up our program by working on separate segments. This more inclusive concept helps us to visualize the total process and to relate ourselves more effectively to it in its various phases. The study emphasizes the need for the social work profession to see its educational responsibility "steadily and whole."

In regard to the educational program itself, the technical aspects require full discussion elsewhere, but the general direction of the thinking can be indicated here. The report calls to our attention the fact that there are certain decisions made by all professions as to how much of the professional education shall be offered in the

³ *Ibid.*, p. 218.

undergraduate college, in a graduate school, and in later practice. Engineering offers considerable technical professional education at an undergraduate level, whereas medicine includes much preprofessional material on the basic sciences within the medical school. After thorough consideration of alternatives, the report confirms in its recommendations for social work the prevailing plan that has developed to date, by which professional education is centered in the graduate school.

The study offers a far broader concept of our responsibilities in relation to the undergraduate college than has been encompassed in our idea of preprofessional courses for social workers. It suggests that we have a double responsibility, first, for identifying the major concepts of social welfare that belong in the common cultural heritage of all college students, and secondly, for organizing a concentration in the arts and sciences basic to graduate professional study for social work. It is recommended that technical social work skills not be taught at the undergraduate level. We are told that long, intensive effort will be required to identify concepts and teaching materials, and to achieve their actual incorporation in the curriculum, but that this is an essential task. This emphasis on the importance of concepts in professional thinking and teaching is a most significant feature of the study, which should be clearly grasped by all readers.

Another important point which emerges from this discussion of undergraduate education is that not only social work but all professions have an interest in improving the character and quality of the general education of their prospective practitioners and in promoting a better understanding of professional concepts that are basic enough to underlie more than one profession.⁴ Thus joint action is implied. The report makes the interesting suggestion that an interprofessions council be formed as the channel for such co-operation.

In regard to graduate professional education for social work, the study confirms the present movement toward a basic curriculum for nonspecialized social workers, which might eventually require two academic years. Much further effort will be needed to organize

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 175.

the curriculum into "comprehensive and related teaching units in which there is articulation of classroom study, field teaching, student advising, and research."⁵ Two major issues regarding which we are asked to give special thought are the place of casework in the curriculum, as related to a broadened concept of social work, and the role of field work in our educational plan.

The report points out that social casework developed more rapidly than other phases of social work, with resultant imbalance in the curriculum. "Casework has been the matrix out of which most social work principles, content, and processes have emerged," says the report:

It still constitutes the core of education for social work because it has within it psychiatric content, principles and processes in working with individuals, social work philosophy and ethics, and conscious attention to professional growth of the student. In planning a whole curriculum, these should be examined as basic elements needed by all students.⁶

Thus a question for social workers to consider is whether the time has come to bring together from casework and other sources the knowledge, skills, and attitudes essential for *all* social work practice and place them squarely in the center of the curriculum.

The study points out that field teaching in social work has its roots in apprenticeship and has not fully made the transition to instruction of a professional character. At its best it offers a significant educational experience for students, but the diversity in objectives and standards in the field as a whole indicates that the educational problems in this area have not been solved. The report stresses the need for relating the field instruction more closely to the total content of the curriculum and to the psychological readiness of the student as he moves through the various phases of professional education. Furthermore, it suggests that schools must attain better control of field teaching in order that there may be assurance of satisfactory quality and genuine integration with the rest of the curriculum. These problems indicate the serious and urgent need for research and experimentation to clarify the objectives, content, and method of field instruction.⁷

After the basic curriculum, it is visualized that students would

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 219.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 225.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 243.

move into advanced curricula for professional specializations. In approaching this subject Dr. Hollis and Miss Taylor recognized that the concept of specialization is a complex and difficult one in social work, as in all professions today. They found it impossible to resolve all the issues within the compass of this initial study. Because this is such a pressing problem in our field, they recommend that we establish a commission under the proposed council on social work education to study the nature of specialization in our field and formulate criteria. Until there are adequate criteria for determining what is basic and what is specialized in social work, satisfactory progress in curriculum building cannot be expected.⁸

Meanwhile, the authors make a fresh approach to the problem in their discussion in the text. They suggest that in defining specializations we shall probably wish to reformulate some of the confusing and limiting concepts which are now prevalent in our field and to think in terms of broader functions. The importance of developing curricula not only for advanced practice but also for such other types of specialization as administration, supervision, teaching, and research is also indicated. The full development of doctorate programs is envisioned for the future.

The third phase of professional education, after graduation from the school of social work, is discussed as the joint responsibility of agencies, organizations, and schools. The central educational functions of each segment of the profession are analyzed in relation to such matters as recruiting, training of students and staff, regulation of practice, and research. While we have been aware of these responsibilities in social work, this over-all review indicates many phases which require extension and strengthening.

The report sets forth a far clearer analysis than we have ever had of the place of the school of social work in the university setting. Sound principles of organization, administration, and finance are defined from the viewpoint of the future development of the profession. The material cuts through the complexities which beset us in the past. We see how we share with all professions some of the difficulties of fitting into an academic world, also some of the special problems we face in social work because of the nature of our

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 398.

discipline. The material on organization and finance is hard-hitting material in a constructive sense. It does not destroy sound values but enables us to face reality and plan better. There are some solid facts on capital and operating costs and salaries which are greatly needed for fuller understanding of the picture. This section of the report is directed not only toward our own group but also toward college administrators and faculties, and interested members of the public. The data, principles, and recommendations of this section should establish our status with these others in very helpful terms. The position of the school of social work and the role of the social work educator on the university faculty are clarified and dignified.

The study also formulates a series of important principles regarding accreditation for social work education. In the United States Office of Education, Dr. Hollis has worked closely with the colleges and universities of the country on problems of professional accrediting, where there have been some crucial developments in recent years. In the study he shares with us his advance thinking on these important issues:

The emerging pattern of professional accreditation calls for cooperative study and action by all parties that have a stake in a given profession. In the field of social work these include at least representatives of schools of social work, of university administration, of organized practitioners, of organized employers, and of the general public.⁹

The inclusion of these additional groups beyond the schools, particularly the public schools, has already stimulated much interest.

In looking back at this discussion of professional education, it can be seen that the study states important principles and suggests possible lines of action but appropriately leaves to higher education and to the social work profession the technical decisions regarding development of curriculum content and teaching methods.

One of the strengths of the study is its emphasis on the interdependence of professional education and practice. We perceived this principle from the first days of the Study Committee meetings and are thankful to have it emerge so clearly in the final document. The report points out that progress in social work education is geared to the stage and rate of evolution of social work theory and practice.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 365.

Thus there is little use in changing a program of education unless the profession changes the way professional social work is practiced.¹⁰

One of the most important recommendations of the study is, therefore, that the profession should devise and use a more inclusive concept of social work. The report comments that the effort of social workers in recent decades to raise their services to the status of a profession has led to a rather restricted character and scope of social work. It advocates "broadening and clarifying concepts of what social work is and what social workers do, because it is not feasible to plan a comprehensive and articulated program of education in the absence of data and a consensus on these fundamentals."¹¹

In the course of the study Dr. Hollis sought for statements of social work objectives and competencies which would serve as a base for an educational curriculum, but as has already been indicated, found none that were sufficiently definitive. Thus a major recommendation, which appears and reappears throughout the report, is that the social work profession should undertake immediately (it is regarded as urgent) a comprehensive and systematic analysis and evaluation of a wide range of social work practice, in order to determine the essential character of social work functions and standards of competence.¹²

The Study Committee originally recommended such a comprehensive study of practice, to be carried on concurrently with the study of social work education. Funds did not permit carrying through this full plan. It is imperative that study of practice should proceed now. The analysis should cover the various functions that are or ought to be performed by general and specialized social workers in various types of work and at various levels of responsibility. As preparation for this study there must be clearer formulation of the goals of social work in our society and the results it hopes to achieve through its various methods. Social workers must face the fact that these steps in analysis and formulation are essential as a foundation for the definition of educational objectives and the building of a professional curriculum.

There are a number of other important areas where research is

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 393.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 168.

recommended. It thus becomes evident that what is needed is a continuing program of professional study and research, covering both education and practice. In the past our efforts have been too ephemeral. Basic problems of this kind cannot be solved through committee deliberation or isolated studies. We must learn that the only way significant progress will be made is through persistent, disciplined effort over the years. We should start at once, but it may be a decade or more before we can hope to see major results.

Thus the study of social work education is raising questions which penetrate to every corner of our work. If we follow through all the implications, there is no stopping place between education and practice. Each rests upon the other, and the possibilities of future growth are interdependent. The basic studies of practice which have been recommended will involve extensive participation by many groups of practitioners. There is so much that we need to know about the nature of our service and its responsibilities that as we go on everyone in the field, whether in practice or education, has potentially something to offer.

A study of education might have been handled so that it was confined mainly to educators themselves. Fortunately, through the early formation of the National Council on Social Work Education and the planning of the study, the major groups in social work practice were also drawn into the enterprise. This emphasis upon the participation of practitioners was continued by the Study Committee and the study staff. Without such inclusion of the whole field the study could not possibly have the broad significance which it now carries.

As we consider the implications of the study we can see that in the past, social workers have been too concerned with segmental, specific, and immediate interests. We have done too much acting and not enough thinking. To attain our full growth we must not only be able to grasp the intellectual concept of a united profession but also to go through a change of feeling which will place togetherness ahead of separateness. We must learn to think and act together in a sustained way toward common objectives. I believe this report has come at the very time when this readiness is developing and may offer a needed channel.

Undoubtedly, the meaning of the study will keep growing, as we know it better. Some of the significant implications we perceive at this time are as follows:

1. The report enables us to see more clearly than ever before what a profession is and the steps we must take in social work to meet our full responsibility in a complex and rapidly changing world.
2. It defines goals and outlines a long-range program, but also indicates manageable undertakings where action should start and the logical order of other steps to follow.
3. It shows convincingly that education is not something remote and academic but a major concern of practitioners as well as educators—in fact, of the whole profession.
4. The report sets forth the basic principles of professional education and practice, on which educators and practitioners working together can build for the future.

The report should be read by every social worker, critically but objectively. The experience of the Study Committee is perhaps significant in this connection. We found that new ways of thinking and feeling were demanded of us. We had to reexamine many ideas and practices we had assumed. We had to look beyond our own field of interest. This report is one which deals with broad fundamentals and does not offer specific solutions for the problems of one group or another. It has to be read and understood by social work readers at the high level at which it is written, that of social work as a whole. We also found that our first reading of the material not infrequently led to partial understanding or premature assumptions as to the meaning. It was only after we had opportunity for discussion with others that we came through to a fuller grasp of what the report was really saying. Thus we moved through early periods of doubt and difficulty toward steadily increasing stimulation and clarification. At the final meeting all members of the Study Committee testified to the professional growth they had experienced through participation in the study. The same type of movement has been observed in many others of the profession who have been in contact with it. Thus the nature of the undertaking which is involved for every social worker in coming to grips with the

report and really absorbing its full meaning should not be underestimated, but assurance can be given that it is in the end enormously rewarding.

It has been the experience of some of us that we obtain from the report a sense of responsibility to think and act which can no longer be evaded. In some ways we have perhaps been overconfident in regard to our accomplishments in social work. With this new perspective we see how much is still to be done. The program here outlined requires a great deal from social work but is surely not beyond our strength.

The impact of this study can have an enormously stimulating effect on social work at this strategic time. It provides a sound framework for growth and a long perspective. Properly used, it can be a means of uniting the profession toward common objectives. The responsibility for translating the report into effective action now rests with the social work profession.

The Midcentury White House *Conference on Children and Youth*

By IRA DE A. REID

MORE THAN TWO DECADES AGO, two astute students of children in America, William I. and Dorothy Thomas, made the following observations:

As the result of rapid communication in space, movements of population (concentration in cities, immigration), changes in the industrial order, the decline of community and family life, the weakening of religion, the universality of reading, the commercialization of pleasure, and for whatever other reasons there may be, we are now witnessing a far-reaching modification of the moral norms and behavior practices of all classes of society. Activities have evolved more rapidly than social structures, personalities more rapidly than social norms. This unstabilization of society and of behavior is probably no more than a stage of disorganization preceding a modified type of reorganization. When old habits break down, when they are no longer adequate, there is always a period of confusion until new habits are established; and this is true of both the individual and society. At present, however, it is widely felt that the demoralization of young persons, the prevalence of delinquency, crime, and profound mental disturbances are very serious problems, and that the situation is growing worse instead of better.

In this general connection there have developed in recent years various types of standpoint, organization and program directed toward the study and control of behavior. . . . In the meantime problems have arisen in these practical programs concerning mental deficiency, emotional instability, habit formation, special disabilities, family relationships, leisure-time activities, gang life of children, etc., and the academic psychologists and sociologists have linked up their research and speculative work. . . . having as main objective the development of scientific techniques as related directly to practical problems.¹

Despite the fact that twenty-eight years later we are concerned with a new child population and with a new formulation of con-

¹ William I. and Dorothy Swaine Thomas, *The Child in America* (New York: Knopf, 1928), pp. xiii-xiv.

ditions for their survival, the general character of the problems faced at the Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth is essentially the same. Studies and experiences before the great depression and before the second great war revealed that the essential need of a child in this culture is that the culture provide for him the means and the conditions through and by which he may exercise his right and privilege to grow to a man's estate, and that he be given the chance to live and act as a growing, well-rounded personality while achieving it. The experiences of the last five years have but strengthened this principle as the one great need of children, here and everywhere.

It is no simple task, however, to summarize the discerning, revealing, and myriad conditions and needs of the 54,000,000 children in the United States. No less simple is it to relate those needs to those of the 172,000,000 European, the 500,000,000 Asiatic, the 76,000,000 African, or the 61,000,000 Latin American children, who are more impoverished than ours. The Conference recognized the task involved in its undertaking. Nevertheless, it sought to understand the forces that were at work within our society and to indicate the ways in which these forces and forms could be used more constructively. The Conference recognized the degree to which man has failed to use the knowledge and the resources that were available to him for meeting this basic need of children in our society, but it did not forget that, from the short-range point of view, man is still at the mercy of apparently irreversible trends that he did not create. With these limitations in mind, let us summarize the Conference as a group of citizens, experts and parents, who sought ways of understanding, applying techniques to, and predicting the needs of children, of speeding up desired trends, and of greatly increasing the opportunities for successful adjustment of the child and of controlling the environment in which he may develop.

Apart from the needs that rise out of the unique stratifications of our society, needs which cut across all American life, the Conference expressed an interest in, and addressed its attention to, such problems as would be involved in the facts that:

3,500,000 children are born into this culture annually;

58 in every 100 of these children live in cities;
19 in every 100 live on farms;
30,000,000 children will be in the elementary schools of our nation in 1960;
8,500,000 will be in high schools in 1960;
these children will need 250,000 additional teachers;
today, there are 6,000,000 youth between the ages of 14 and 20 who are not in school;
more than 3,000,000 children between the ages of 5 and 17 were not in school in October, 1949.

They found concern in such facts as:

between 1948 and 1949 more than 8,000,000 children moved;
the increasing number of married couples between the ages of 14 and 20;
the 2,500,000 children under 18 living with a parent whose home has been broken by widowhood or divorce;
the less-well-educated mothers who continue to produce a disproportionate share of the nation's children;
the increasing number of children born outside marriage;
the significance of a divorce rate that is related to the fact that in 1948, 58 percent of the divorces were granted to couples who had no children.

The Conference was concerned with these facts because they had meaning in a culture where:

11,000,000 more workers were producing in 1949 than in 1929;
the income per family member in 1948 was \$1,085;
family income in terms of buying power had decreased since 1945;

more of the family income is now spent on things other than the necessities of food, shelter, and clothing;

the average weekly income for all families in 1948 was \$61—for white families, \$64; for Negro and other nonwhite families, \$34; for urban families, \$68; for rural nonfarm families, \$57; for farm families, \$40; for husband-wife families, \$63; and for broken families headed by a woman, \$40;

25 out of every 100 children born in 1948 were born into families having an annual income of less than \$2,000;

one out of every three Negro babies born had no medical attendance at delivery.

Beyond all of this, the Conference recognized the needs as existing for all children. The Conference emphasized the word "all" because it connotes a significant and fundamental meaning in a democracy, where the right true ends of the democratic process may be prostituted by invidious distinctions based upon sex or class or race, upon religion or creed or nationality or ancestry.

This recital of specific and pertinent needs could be continued indefinitely. The national, state and local literature on the Conference will provide more pertinent data than I could effectively relate at this time. Permit me, therefore, to encompass the needs of children as they were expressed by the Conference in six significant categories of needs that seem to cover its general discussions.

1. *The need to be understood as a personality.*—This need assumes the right of a child to be well-born, a precept that is a fundamental part of our culture's theory of child rights and child privileges. We have, however, taken a traditional position with respect to the ways in which a child should be reared. And I think we might concur with one of the findings of a subgroup which concluded that we have not yet developed a science of child rearing. The child as a member of our society is the social result of the feeding situation, cleanliness training, sex training, and the treatment of anger responses. According to one theory, as society imposes its will through the acts of the parents, the child reacts in a blind, emotional way. The results of these periods of training may produce long-lasting effects upon the character and habits of the personality. For this reason, it is important that we know how children learn in our culture in order that we may change such patterns as may cause them to be ill-equipped for the highly charged social experiences they are going to face.

2. *The need for remodeled nurturing situations.*—The influences of the home, the school, and the religious institution in fulfilling the needs of the developing child were mentioned again and again in the Conference discussions. There was no doubt that the presence and performance of these institutions affected the development of the child. There was some question as to whether or not

the existing forms of the home, the school, or the church actually contributed to the development of healthy personalities. Many of the interpretations of the roles of these institutions had implications of moralization rather than objectivity. This tendency to idealize the old form, or to restrain the development of the emergent forms of family life, education, or religious practices, was regarded as a severe handicap to the developing child. The need for remodeling the family could be met, for example, if parents regarded the child as an end in himself and not a means to the end of another. It might be correct to say that true parenthood is not present unless the child's own developing within the family situation is regarded as the chief goal.

A similar problem arises in connection with the dissolution of marriage for reasons other than death. Concern over the increasing number of persons who are seeking release from marriage, says one Conference group, should not necessarily mean that persons discovering their incompatibilities should continue to live in a socially disorganized relationship. It does indicate that more attention should be given to preparation for marriage, and to the ethical and personality factors that make for successful living together. The success of the family as a nurturing institution is closely correlated with the practicing compatibility of the parents.

No less significant as a nurturing institution is the school. One is prone to think that our culture expects too much from the school when we ask it to assume a greater responsibility for meeting the needs of our children. Margaret Mead has pointed out that our children are facing a world which this adult generation is unable to grasp, to manage, or to plan for. It has "late-born children whose mother finds that nothing she learned ten years ago about how to treat children or of what to expect from them, can be applied to children who seem to have learned to cry with a new note in their voices, who will have to have different clothes, will display different tastes, and will weep for quite different reasons."²

The adults in the modern world face children who are not only unlike those in their own past childhood, but who are actually un-

² Margaret Mead, *The School in American Culture* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1951), p. 23.

like any children who have ever been in the world before. The fantastic rate of change in our culture has given us children of five who have already incorporated into their everyday thinking, ideas that most of their elders will never fully assimilate. Within the lifetime of ten-year-olds the world has entered a new age, and even before they enter the sixth grade, the atomic age has been followed by the age of the hydrogen bomb. Teachers who never heard a radio until they were adults must cope with children who have never known a world without television. Teachers who struggled in their childhood with a buttonhook find it difficult to describe a buttonhook to a child enclosed in zippers. Thus, the child of this generation seems to need teachers who not only know how to teach but how to teach what they do not know, to solve unknown problems. In many fields, the teacher with two years of experience may have a better understanding of the world of her young wards than the teacher with twenty years of experience in the classroom. Despite this paradox, our culture must find ways to give the child the sense of an un-guessed-at process with which he should be equipped to make the new inventions of his world. In order more fully to achieve this end there is need for a more universal opportunity for persons to achieve the highest education of which they are capable.

The Conference recognized that "knowledge and understanding of religious and ethical concepts are essential to the development of spiritual values, and that nothing is of greater importance to the moral and spiritual health of our Nation than the work of religious education in our homes and families, and in our institutions of organized religion." It also sensed the need for maintaining the separation of Church and State in matters of education. But it must be admitted that the Conference did not give to youth a clean bill of particulars in this matter of religion and its meaning for their development. On this point I think we may well say to today's children: With honesty and candor, we apologize for not having explored the religious aspect of your culture and its relation to your needs with more certainty and objectivity, and with the thoroughness and the concern which it merits. We have tempered our affirmations and harnessed our negations. The best we can say is that every

society desperately needs morality in the sense of common standards, and religion in the sense of orientations toward such inescapable problems as death, individual responsibility, and other ultimate value-attitudes. We believe that you need this sort of faith to promote social solidarity and individual security by affirming and symbolically enacting a system of common purposes—we cannot tell you how it can be achieved within our culture.

3. *Freedom from the market.*—The findings of the Conference expressed the members' grave concern over the social and economic exploitation of our children. It was not alone the problem of child labor that concerned us. We saw the need of freeing children from the blind appeals and controls of the box-top advertising, give-away programs, from the lure of bounteous consumption when there were no means or uses to justify the purchases. The new conditions of our social and economic life necessitate that we, through a more aptly conceived guidance program and through more social controls, free children from the child-centered appeals of the mass media of comics, radio, and television, whether such appeals be used for welfare or for commerce.

4. *Extended and remodeled public and private services.*—Despite the fact that the volume of public and private services available to children and their parents or guardians is greater than ever before, the Conference saw as one of the greatest needs for the present and the future child the extension of these services in the fields of education, physical and mental health, and preventive and corrective welfare. It saw a need for the elimination of some agencies, for the remodeling of others; for an increasing emphasis upon the problems of the individual; and, above all, for an expanded program of professional and in-service education by, with, and in those agencies that serve children in any way. We saw a special need for constructing and maintaining high standards of personnel and service in our public agencies.

5. *The need for community reconstruction.*—The Conference as a whole saw little need in making any or all of the aforementioned changes in our program for meeting the needs of children if we did nothing to alter the general social and economic climate of our communities. They were particularly concerned over the permis-

sive conditions which permitted the survival of low economic standards, inadequate incomes, urban and rural slums, continuous migration in search of economic competence, excessive morbidity and mortality, inadequate hospitalization, low real incomes, inability to acquire an education, discrimination on account of race, religion, nationality, and such permissive forms of aggression as war. They suggested that it is the responsibility of every community, be it a hamlet, a village, a city, a state or a nation, to see to it that every child has the opportunity to grow up in a strong, healthy community. It also suggested that in these days of emergency and military preparation, the communities recognize the need for protecting the healthy personalities of children from the unanticipated consequences of these programs.

6. *The need for the benefits of our development of pertinent knowledge.*—I can see no better way of summarizing the discussion on this point than by using the excellent statement of Leonard Mayo, chairman of the Conference's Executive Committee. Mr. Mayo said:

If we are to make substantial advances in application in the next decade, we must work consciously and assiduously to develop . . . [a] scientific attitude of mind; not an ordinary open mind, but a searching one; not just an inquiring mind, but a mind and a heart that have what Einstein has called "a passion for comprehension"; a mind that does not reject simply because it does not know, which does not let bias rule, nor allow insistence on one point of view to have sway.³

The acceptance of this need requires that citizens, experts, parents, and youth themselves, do a better job than they have been doing. It means that we shall have to give to children the benefit of a challenge hurled by Dr. Benjamin Spock when he said that "there are no good reasons aside from the immense inertia of our institutions and customs why we cannot improve this situation."⁴ Nor can we ignore the earth-moving suggestion of Professor Allison Davis when he pointed out that schools must discover and train effectively many more of the able children from the lower socio-

³ "From Conference Statements and Reports," *School Life*, XXXIII, No. 6 (March, 1951), 94.

⁴ Benjamin Spock, M.D., "Development of Healthy Personalities in Children," *ibid.*, p. 86.

economic groups; that "more than 70 out of every 100 of our elementary school children come from these lower socio-economic groups—most of their ability is misdirected, or wasted. This vast store of ability in these millions of children . . . is largely wasted because their teachers do not understand the basic cultural habits of the working groups."⁵ The suggestion has meaning for all of us who are working in the area of social reform and reconstruction.

As a result of the Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth we no longer need to "ad lib" the needs of American children for surviving in a world they never made. We continue to need the zeal and the resources for making the performance of our democratic society conform to the script we have so earnestly contrived.

⁵ Allison Davis, "Socio-economic Influences upon Children's Learning," *ibid.*, p. 87.

Special Needs of Congested Communities and of Defense Workers

By JAMES B. CAREY

THE NEEDS WHICH I WRITE are not new, not unique to the present emergency, and are not to be blamed entirely on the imperialistic ambitions of Stalin. They are special only in the sense that the American defense emergency will exaggerate them. If we have a tendency to view these problems in defense communities as resulting from military and industrial mobilization alone we are making a mistake, the same dangerous mistake we made during the Second World War.

It is not that the defense emergency has made our community services inadequate. They always have been. They always will be, if we worry about them only in time of international conflict. They always will be, if the only way we can have full employment and full production is to have a tin Attila like Stalin start trying to push us around.

I represent that vast group of Americans who, next to our G.I.'s, will be most affected by the present emergency. America's 16,000,000 organized workers represent the vital core of America's labor force, the heart of our productive machine. When we speak of needs of congested communities and defense workers, we are speaking of their needs. And they have some very definite ideas about what those needs are.

The fight for a fair and democratic mobilization program is not just labor's fight. Sometimes we have to fight it alone, and always we have to take the blame for the blunt, impolite words and the purposeful action that have become increasingly necessary in Washington. But the benefits fall to the unorganized as to the organized—to the consumers, the factory workers, the farmers, and, yes, to business itself. Perhaps most of all those whom social work is trying

to serve, the present and potential consumers of welfare services, are the beneficiaries of our fight.

Our primary and well-publicized concern about stabilization, manpower, production, prices, and government labor policy does not mean that organized labor is unaware of the importance of the organized health, welfare, and recreational facilities and services. These problems are not new to us, and we are every bit as anxious as you are to do something constructive about them. Social workers have social conviction about, and professional interest in, the health and welfare needs of people. We, as trade unionists, are elected by those people specifically to see that those needs are taken care of.

Let us start with children. Their needs are not new ones. Our free school system still does not serve our children as we would like to have them served, in peace or in war. More than 4,000,000 children attend school in substandard classrooms and buildings. According to the Census Bureau, within the next ten years there will be over 10,000,000 more children in our population than there were in 1950. Studies by the United States Office of Education show that such an increase in school population will make it essential to provide 520,000 new classrooms and 750,000 new teachers within the ten-year period. Yet at the present rate of training, less than 300,000 teachers will be added during this critical decade.

Another, and long-standing, weakness in our educational system is that of the glaring inequalities in segregated schools. The defense emergency should bring added attention to this situation. Even if facilities and opportunities and standards for Negro and for white school programs *were* equal, segregation would still represent an evil blot on our national honor.

But the fact is that the educational facilities under segregation are not equal, opportunities for education and training for life are not equal, standards are not equal. It is estimated that expenditures of more than \$400,000,000 would be needed to bring segregated facilities up to the already inadequate standards of white schools in those states which practice segregation in education.

The defense emergency, with its sudden population shifts and expansion in defense production centers, makes all the more necessary a bold federal program of aid to education. We advocate that

Congress enact immediately a broad program of federal aid to ensure, with federal funds added to state appropriations, steadily improved facilities both for elementary and for high schools, and to guarantee every child, regardless of race, color, or creed, a good education, every class a good teacher, and every teacher a decent salary.

This program should include a provision that the individual states should make the decisions as to whether nonpublic schools are to be eligible for federal aid and as to the kinds of services that are to be covered in such schools by the federal grants; a provision that at least 75 percent of federal funds expended under the program shall be earmarked for teachers' salaries; and further provisions calling for at least \$3,000,000,000 to be expended over a five-year period for a comprehensive national school construction program; a bill furnishing federal aid to the states for college scholarships for students who could not otherwise attend higher institutions; an adequate budget for the present school lunch program; a labor education extension service bill providing for industrial workers' services along the lines of those now available to farmers through the Department of Agriculture program; a bill authorizing \$35,000,000 a year for grants to aid the states in developing sorely needed health services for elementary and secondary school children; a bill aiding the states to establish demonstrations of free library service in areas inadequately served or without any library facilities.

The emergency also serves to high-light needs for child welfare services, both public and voluntary. The growing proportion of women workers in the labor force, many of them mothers of small children, creates some very special problems which present services are and have been inadequate to meet.

The Congress of Industrial Organization has been explicit in its policies about the rights of women in industry. I believe we pioneered in making maternity-leave clauses features of collective bargaining contracts, and the C.I.O. long has been strictly opposed to discrimination against women in industry. We have urged experimentation by both government and private employers with part-time work for married women. We are on record as to the right

of women to work on an equal status with men and with equal rights in all respects. In the defense emergency particularly, women can render a profound service to the nation by taking jobs in industry. To assure the full and effective utilization of women in the defense effort, we are urging that special attention be given by government and by community service organizations to those services which will make it possible for women to earn a living without jeopardizing their health or the welfare of their families.

Let me hasten to say that we are not advocating, as some people unfortunately may, that every woman should work, or even be encouraged to work, regardless of her family situation. The special needs of children and of infants must be considered. We do not want a Nazi-Soviet system of throwing infants into collectivized group care centers. I am no child psychologist, and I will leave theories to those who specialize in such matters. But I am a parent. I know that until they reach a certain age, children need their mothers. They need them more than industry needs them.

We feel strongly that in connection with the manpower program and the recruitment of women workers, the services of child welfare agencies and professional child welfare workers must be brought into play fully to guarantee that the rights and needs of children are protected and that individual family counseling is readily available.

We are concerned about the inadequacy of day care facilities and about the poor standards under which many so-called "day care centers" or nursery schools are allowed to operate. An absolute prerequisite for the effective utilization of women in industry in the emergency—and a fundamental guarantee for the children of women who must work in any period—is the development of a sound day care program operated under mandatory minimum standards.

The Child Welfare League, which has been carrying out extensive studies of day care needs in defense areas, warned as early as September of 1950 that day care provisions were "woefully inadequate" and that "waiting lists in many of the League's member nurseries even before the Korean war showed that one child was in urgent need of day care service for every two receiving it." I am

told that there are now fewer day care centers in operation than during the Second World War. Yet our child population has grown by millions, and the number of women in the labor force has increased vastly and may be expected far to exceed the wartime peak as defense mobilization hits its stride. Many are so poorly organized and staffed as to endanger the welfare of the children placed in their care. Only half our states require that all persons professionally engaged in care for children provide at least minimum standards. In many states that have such legislation, it is not enforced actively.

We are very much disturbed about what we see happening and we want and need the help of social work in securing the proper standards and the correct kind of legislation to guarantee the full rights of children and families. In turn, of course, we believe that we can help you in the job you are trying to carry out. We like clear issues and we like to fight for principles.

During the last war we had some experience with employers who set up day care centers under management auspices at the factories. Some of these were fancy operations indeed, thanks to the cost-plus war contract policies then in effect. They represented management paternalism financed by the taxpayer.

We are opposed to management-operated child care programs of this kind for two very good and sound reasons. First, we believe that community social services should receive the full support of corporations as well as of employees. We of the C.I.O. follow the principle that our members are community citizens and have a responsibility to support and participate in health and welfare services for the entire community. If we did not, if we followed the Communist or the National Association of Manufacturers line which teaches that workers have no interests in common with the rest of the community, we would set up our own social service agencies and hire our own nursery teachers. When management sponsors plant-operated day care programs, management has interests other than those of the community in mind. Management is thus diverting support from inadequately financed community welfare programs for selfish purposes.

Second, of course, is the danger to the children implicit in such programs. We recognize that the environmental factor involved is a serious one. During the last war we found that one of the major social problems in war-impact communities was the difficulty of integrating new families into the normal community pattern. War workers, housed as they often were in plant-satellite fringe areas, and regarded with prejudice and suspicion by native residents, found it difficult to adjust, to achieve a normal and healthy sense of belonging in their new homes. Preschool-age children lodged in plant day care centers or nursery schools during their mothers' working hours often found it impossible to form the normal neighborhood friendships so important to childhood.

We have learned through the bitterest sort of experience that any program which tends to separate the industrial worker and his family from the community, to exaggerate his sense of dependency upon the plant for services and activities which normally lie within the community province, is in the end socially evil. Surely the object lessons of the collectivist Soviet and Nazi states, which have sought with tragic successes to create a working class totally subservient to the industrial plant and to the ends of production, dehumanized and robot-minded, must guide us here.

Another essential need is housing and rent control. As early as the fall of 1950 the beginnings of defense mobilization, coupled with long-standing housing shortages in production areas, ran into manpower recruitment problems, and this threat to economic mobilization, rearmament, and increased aid to our allies is becoming daily more serious. Neither the housing industry nor government has taken any effective steps to increase the availability of housing at a price level which would make it possible for workers to secure adequate shelter for their families in an environment that would enhance the well-being of their children. At the same time, the real estate lobby has succeeded in wheedling Congress into approval of a local option system allowing localities to decontrol rents entirely. As a result, in 1950, more than 10,500,000 dwelling units were decontrolled. In many cities, rents have risen 25 percent, 30 percent, 40 percent, and more. Near military centers, rents have risen as

much as 60 percent. Not even the families of servicemen are protected against the rent profiteers, who are running wild today as they did before control in 1941. This is very ugly. But it is true.

One would think that those who could do something about this situation in Congress would care. The extent of their care seems measured by the fact that rents in the District of Columbia, where our Senators and Representatives live, are not decontrolled. I suspect that so long as our Congressmen live there, they never will be.

We are fighting with renewed vigor for an adequate middle-income housing bill, and for special consideration of housing needs in defense communities. We are fighting for a new and effective rent control program, a program such as we had during and following the Second World War. May I suggest that this is your fight too?

Another grave problem which has been with us a long time and which mobilization will aggravate unless we take action is that of race relations and discrimination which I mentioned briefly in reference to our school system. This is a problem close to the C.I.O., and one to which we have been giving active attention since the birth of our organization. I speak with particular concern about this as chairman of the C.I.O.'s Committee to Abolish Discrimination. Discrimination relates not only to employment and education and housing and health. It relates to the total life and activities of the person or family discriminated against, and it is with the total problem that the C.I.O. is concerned.

Unlike the "boosters" of the twenties celebrated by Sinclair Lewis, we in the labor movement do not think that our particular home town is the best little town in the best little county in the best great state in the best nation on what is surely the most perfect earth. We are for progress in terms of human welfare. And being for progress in such terms, we are against those demonstrable defects in our way of life from which we wish to progress. Even though we are better off than the citizens of the Soviet Union, that does not mean that we are perfect or that we should ignore our slums, our wage inequities, our rent and price profiteering, our children's uncertain plight, or the way we mistreat our so-called "minority" citizens.

As Americans, we are proud that our Americanism inspires us to be self-critical and to speak up against our home-grown evils. I believe that we are better optimists than the cheerful, 200-percent American ostriches whose tail feathers proudly wave in so many of our home towns. I believe that we are better Americans than those who do not believe that our way of life, our free society, can provide better benefits for all our citizens. Therein lies the essential affirmation of our belief in our nation and its ideals which we express in denial that our present social defects are a necessary concomitant of freedom.

We speak *for* the right of all citizens. We are *against* discrimination. We are against it, whether it be in the armed forces, in employment, in housing, in medical and hospital care, in education, in transportation, or in any other important aspect of community living.

Let me acknowledge that we occasionally have our own internal problems. We do not hold up the labor movement as a perfect institution. Our movement is a free association of Americans joined in trade unions of their own choosing. Individual union members have differing beliefs and are subject to the same prejudices as other citizens in the community. Basically, however, the labor movement stands against discrimination, and our unions have adopted forthright policies through convention action and through the establishment of committees against discrimination at both the national and local union levels.

But we would be remiss if we were content merely to legislate internally against discrimination and to educate our membership against prejudice. Our unions are not only industrial but community organizations, and we are pledged to fight discrimination alongside other concerned groups wherever it appears. We have supported and worked closely with such splendid organizations as the National Urban League, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the National Y.W.C.A., and other groups for many years, and in the present situation we are determined to intensify our activities.

We have pledged ourselves to secure passage of a permanent Fair Employment Practices Act. We are fighting to see that such federal

aid programs as are adopted, in education, housing, child welfare, and other important fields, are designed to assure equal benefits for minorities and other guarantees against discrimination by states.

In defense-impact communities particularly, racial tensions surely will develop to a critical point unless citizens and their organizations and agencies devote serious attention to the problem in advance. There is not a single voluntary or public social welfare agency which is not in one way or another concerned. I hope that social workers will do everything possible to stimulate coordinated planning to meet this problem. I would urge you, too, to be sure that the labor movement is brought into the process; for we are deeply concerned and we can and will help. I certainly hope, too, that such planning takes into account the long- as well as the short-range nature of our race relations problem, instead of viewing it as born of defense needs. There are no temporary solutions for old and rooted evils.

One of our major weaknesses lies in the lack of coordination and the need for long-range perspective. This is a weakness native not only to voluntary organizations but to government. During the Second World War we had more agencies dealing with these problems than there were problems. Almost every arm of government had a department or bureau or office competing with some other branch of some other arm for the solution of some war-related social problem. This was fine to the extent that it provided employment for a lot of excellent social scientists of one school or another, but when the programs they devised helter-skelter reached the state or local community, the results were, to say the least, scattered.

I hope that we can organize vitally important public and voluntary programs a little better this time. Certainly there are some hopeful signs in the voluntary field with the organization this year by the national agencies of the United Community Defense Services to give coordinated and specialized attention to some of these problems in the defense centers. The National C.I.O. Community Services Committee, our social welfare planning arm, is participating in this new coordinated agency, and we are going to do everything in our power to make its work effective and successful nationally and in the local community.

But government is lagging behind the voluntary social services. A few bills have been introduced, and largely ignored. I should like to go on record for the establishment of a centralized federal agency to coordinate all defense-related health, welfare, and recreation programs under a single administrator responsible to the President. Only through such coordination of federal activities can defense community needs be properly high-lighted and services to meet them effectively focused and balanced.

We are concerned about recreation programs and facilities, as we are about schools and housing and child welfare services. We are very concerned about the development of an adequate civil defense program; for defense production areas would be the real targets of attacking bombers. We are more than concerned with the total lack of recognition of labor's stake and labor's interest displayed so far by the Civil Defense Administration and by many state and local governments. We are disturbed about the inadequacies and inequities in the state unemployment compensation and workmen's compensation programs in the face of mobilization demands. We are worried about the long-standing inadequacies of public assistance programs in the light of increased problems of migratory workers and servicemen's families.

The picture, then, is not hopeful. We find ourselves in another national emergency not much better prepared than we were in 1940 or 1941. We find ourselves, if anything, less united than we were prior to Pearl Harbor. Certainly Congress is showing no better vision about the people's needs than it did a decade ago.

It appears that organizations like the National Conference of Social Work and the C.I.O., which see these needs clearly, will have to come a little closer together. I believe we can help each other. I am sure that together we can make some of the very important things that we believe, that good Americans have always believed, come true. If we keep in mind that the problems we Americans face in our home communities are not new problems, not problems foisted upon us from abroad and therefore dangerous just because we face a possible war, but home-born and bred by fear and reaction, then we can lick this thing. I believe that if we look courageously, we will find the answers.

Community Values in Civil Defense

By JAMES J. WADSWORTH

PEOPLE WHO ARE CONCERNED with welfare work must, first of all, be realists. The need for social work exists in large part because of the unpleasant realities of human life. No person in social work who fails to accept these realities can be successful.

In the same way, we of the Civil Defense Administration are concerned with realities. We too deal in human problems and human values. But there is this difference: civil defense affects every person regardless of his economic or social status. If every person accepted the realities that make civil defense one of the great needs of our time, our job would be a much, much, simpler one.

How great is the need for civil defense? Once a handful of facts are faced, it becomes apparent to any thinking person that the need for civil defense is as great a need as this country ever has had. The facts are, as many of our leaders, including the President, emphasized in Washington on May 7, 1951, that we can be attacked, that we may be attacked, that our military defenses cannot be absolute.

This means that it is entirely possible for our country to be attacked with atomic weapons. The connotations are tremendous, both in human and physical terms. We must have an organization that is adequate to cope with disaster far greater than any nation in the world ever has experienced. We must have that organization now. Civil defense will provide that organization if it is permitted to do so.

We asked some three hundred leading national organizations to meet with us in Washington on May 7 and 8. The purpose was to present the problem of civil defense and to ask the nation's organizations, which represent over fifty million Americans, to aid us in arousing public interest, in inspiring the participation of their membership, and in helping us to do the tremendous educational job necessary.

We think the job will be done. A great number of organizations

have approached us with definite plans. We believe that it will not be many months before the nation is aroused to the need for civil defense and people everywhere are actively doing something about it.

But this still will not be enough. We of the Federal Civil Defense Administration must do our part. We can and are developing coordinated national plans. Many of these plans already have been released. We can provide guidance and we are doing so.

But plans and guidance are not enough. The civil defense organization must have equipment and supplies. It must have a warning system to sound the alarm. It must have the equipment with which to fight fires, to treat the wounds of the injured, to house the homeless, to clear away debris, to restore utilities, to remove people from damaged buildings, and to take the special precautions required against atomic, biological, or chemical warfare.

This equipment costs money. It costs a great deal of money. Our plans have been made on the most realistic basis possible, with only a minimum of equipment allotted, yet the cost still will be great.

The price of freedom is not a small one. Many consider it a misfortune to have been born in an era when freedom is threatened as never before. We have fought two wars against those who would enslave us. Now we face an enemy more powerful, more determined, more resourceful than any enemy in our history. The treasure of America is flowing around the world as we make every effort to bolster our allies, to create bulwarks against this enemy. We hope this effort to keep peace will succeed. We hope that our freedom can be maintained through peaceful means. But we cannot depend on it. When it comes to waging war, we no longer are masters of our own destiny. We cannot say whether or not war will be waged. The initiative is in the hands of the enemy. If it suits his purposes, he will attack.

This fact is recognized in the great effort we are making to arm. Not long ago President Truman said, and I quote: "We must prepare ourselves to mobilize quickly for war in case the Kremlin is reckless enough, in spite of everything, to plunge the world into a general conflict." The President also said, "Since last June, about 26 billion dollars worth of orders have been placed for military

equipment and construction." He added, "Moreover, we still have about 58 billion dollars worth of orders to place in the next 14 months, under our present military plans."

This money is for the sinews of war. Our armed forces must have them if they are to be ready. But, in spite of the vast expenditure of time, energy, facilities, materials, and money for military defense, we have the assurance of the President and the Department of Defense itself that in the event of war the cities of the United States could and almost certainly would be attacked. They have informed us that some of these attacks would succeed in spite of every effort we could make.

In other words, the heart land of freedom, the United States itself, can expect attack in the event of war. This attack could be with many kinds of modern weapons, including atomic bombs. It follows inevitably, then, that the homeland must prepare itself for war. This preparation is civil defense. Civil defense, as has been recognized by many of our nation's leaders, is of equal importance with military defense.

How close are we, then, to civil defense preparedness? How much money has been spent for the goods of civil defense? If \$26,000,000,000 have been spent for military equipment and \$58,000,000,000 more will be spent in the next fourteen months, how much has been spent for equally vital civil defense equipment?

The answer is *none*.

It takes \$3,000 to supply one first-aid station's equipment to handle casualties during the first few hours of an atomic disaster. It would take a minimum of ninety-seven first-aid stations to handle the casualties which would result from one Hiroshima-type bomb. Today, how many first-aid stations can the federal government provide with bandages, surgical instruments, and all the other necessary items, from federal stockpiles?

Again, the answer is *none*.

Within the next few days the Congress will vote a deficiency appropriation for civil defense. In acting on the civil defense appropriation measure, the House of Representatives reduced the recommended amount to \$186,750,000. Of this amount, \$100,000,000 was to be an emergency fund to be used only in case of actual dis-

aster. How we were to use that \$100,000,000 for preparation after the bombs fell was not stated. Money spent after an attack would not provide the bandages, surgical instruments, and other things that would be desperately needed. The Senate, recognizing this fact, removed the \$100,000,000, and came up with the sum of \$85,000,000 for civil defense.

The Senate also recommended \$50,000,000 to build emergency schools in new defense production areas. Fifty million dollars' worth of schools for a few new areas and only \$85,000,000 for the homefront protection of the entire country. But the financial picture is not entirely black. We have every hope that the facts will be faced. Within a short time we shall present a proposed budget for the fiscal year 1952 to the Congress. If the facts are faced, sufficient money will be allotted so that civil defense can start to buy the equipment we must have to meet an enemy attack.

Meanwhile, we must prepare the human organization which will use this equipment. We have estimated that over fifteen million Americans must actively participate in the civil defense organization. These people must be recruited, and they must be trained. Men of good will can do much in a disaster, but they cannot operate effectively without organization and training. This training must be given in many fields. One of these is a field in which social workers have a particular skill—that of caring for human needs under difficult conditions.

The job is a big one. In some fields of civil defense we have little experience from which to draw. In your particular field we have much experience, but it must be translated in terms of greater disaster than any which has ever befallen America. Where, in peacetime, disasters make homeless or destitute perhaps thousands of persons, wartime disaster with atomic bombs can disrupt the lives and homes of hundreds of thousands. It is one of the facts we must face that, in case of atomic attack, there will be hundreds of thousands who are homeless, destitute, sole survivors of families, with no future except what we can provide.

We must be prepared for the greatest human salvage job of which we can conceive. We must be prepared to feed, shelter, clothe, care for, and rehabilitate on an emergency basis a significant

percentage of our population. Nor must we think of these potential disaster victims as mere "cases." They will be more than that. They will be fighters for freedom. And our organization must be geared to return them to the fight as soon as possible, like the men of the armed forces. Theirs will be the home-front fight—the fight to keep our production going so that we may supply our armed forces with the goods of war. The armed forces can be only as strong as the home front makes them, both spiritually and materially. The strength of our country is in the ability and the will of our people to fight back, to produce, and to win.

Without civil defense, there could be no effective production in our industrial centers. Without civil defense there could be no quick restoration of facilities. Without civil defense there could be no quick rehabilitation of our people. Without these things there could be no will to fight back.

We *will* have civil defense, and as a coequal with the armed forces. Civil defense must have the equipment with which to meet disaster. It must have people who are trained to meet disaster. Civil defense is the biggest job we ever have faced. Since we are Americans, we can face it. We must face it. With the cooperation of all, I promise that the job will be done—and done well. If we are to survive, we have no other choice.

Dominant and Variant Cultural Value Orientations

By FLORENCE ROCKWOOD KLUCKHOHN

FOR ALL THOSE CONCERNED with the lives of individuals and the problems which arise in those lives there has long been a question—even an argument—as to how much the individual is a product of his biological heritage and how much the result of environmental forces. That either a strictly biological or an oversimply formulated environmental theory of human behavior is absurdly one-sided most of us have long ago accepted. Yet most of us also know that we are really only at the beginning of the time-consuming and arduous process from which we hope to derive an understanding of that infinitely complicated interplay of biological, psychological, social, and other factors which create the personality and character structure of individuals. We still display a tendency to concentrate on certain factors and exclude others. Some are too much given to interpretations in strictly psychological terms; some too eager to use only the conceptual lenses provided by the sociologist, the anthropologist, or the economist; and others equally zealous with still other approaches.

Today the awareness is growing—rapidly growing—that anything like a full understanding of the concrete situations in which we see individuals requires a use of the explanatory concepts of more than one discipline and requires their use in other ways than an occasional “borrowing” to account for the extraneous. The goal of an integration of our several approaches to a study of human behavior and social situations is clearly before us and recognized as a goal, yet no one can rightly claim that we are close to achieving it.

One specific example of this growing interest in the multiple rather than the unitary approach to individual and social problems

is found in the current and frequent linkage of the terms "culture" and "personality." The practical reflection of this we find in the frequent queries of many in the fields of education, social work, colonial administration, and industry as to what a knowledge of cultural factors offers them for a better understanding of situations and individuals. Even clinical psychologists and psychiatrists, whose theories have necessarily centered upon the psychological processes of the individual, are asking what the effect of varying cultural patterns upon the actions and motives of individuals may be.

Some real progress has been made, especially in the last decade or so, in bringing together psychological and sociocultural theories. For those interested in a very brief sketch of the history of this development I recommend Ralph Linton's Foreword to Dr. Abram Kardiner's *The Psychological Frontiers of Society*.¹

Illustrative of the kind of conceptual integration which has to date been achieved, Linton points to the concept of "basic personality" which he and Dr. Kardiner developed in their collaborative work. Basic personality, he states, is a configuration involving several different elements. It rests upon the following postulates:

1. That the individual's early experiences exert a lasting effect upon his personality, especially upon the development of his projective systems.
2. That similar experiences will tend to produce similar personality configurations in the individuals who are subjected to them.
3. That the techniques which the members of any society employ in the care and rearing of children are culturally patterned and will tend to be similar, although never identical, for various families within the society.
4. That the culturally patterned techniques for the care and rearing of children differ from one society to another.

If these postulates are correct, and they seem to be supported by a wealth of evidence, it follows:

1. That the members of any given society will have many elements of early experience in common.
2. That as a result of this they will have many elements of personality in common.
3. That since the early experience of individuals differs from one so-

¹ New York: Columbia University Press, 1945.

ciety to another, the personality norms for various societies will also differ.

The *basic personality type* for any society is that personality configuration which is shared by the bulk of the society's members as a result of the early experiences which they have in common. It does not correspond to the total personality of the individual but rather to the projective systems or, in different phraseology, the value-attitude systems which are basic to the individual's personality configuration. Thus the same basic personality type may be reflected in many different forms of behavior and may enter into many different total personality configurations.²

An excellent and somewhat more general statement of the importance of cultural factors in the formation of personality is that of Kluckhohn and Murray:

The similarities of character within a group are traceable less to constitutional factors than to formative influences of the environment to which all members of the group have been subjected. Of these group-membership determinants, culture is with little doubt the most significant. To say that "culture determines" is, of course, a highly abstract way of speaking. What one actually observes is the interaction of people. One never sees "culture" any more than one sees "gravity." But "culture" is a very convenient construct which helps in understanding certain regularities in human events, just as "gravity" represents one type of regularity in physical events. Those who have been trained in childhood along traditional lines, and even those who have as adults adopted some new design for living, will be apt to behave predictably in many contexts because of a prevailing tendency to conform to group standards . . .

Not only the action patterns but also the motivational systems of individuals are influenced by culture. Certain needs are biologically given, but many others are not. All human beings get hungry, but no gene in any chromosome predisposes a person to work for a radio or a new car or a shell necklace or "success." Sometimes biologically given drives, such as sex, are for longer or shorter periods subordinated to culturally acquired drives, such as the pursuit of money or religious asceticism. And the means by which needs are satisfied are ordinarily defined by cultural habits and fashions.³

These anthropologists, psychologists, and psychiatrists, and many another in all these fields, have focused well our attention upon the

² *Ibid.*, pp. vii-viii.

³ Clyde Kluckhohn and Henry A. Murray, *Personality in Nature, Society and Culture* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1950), pp. 40-41.

relation of culture and personality. But for all the valuable insights produced and the considerable progress thus far achieved there are some severe and—in this writer's opinion—quite justified criticisms which have been made of many of the facile conclusions drawn. Especially in some of the recent interpretations of so-called "national character" one notes repeatedly the tendency to derive from a few specific items of cultural content highly generalized and far-sweeping conclusions about personality or character structure. Sociologists and psychologists alike have caviled at the apparent ignoring of interaction processes by some anthropologists and at the too deterministic effects often claimed for cultural factors.

In some large part the difficulties in all attempts to use the cultural anthropologists' concepts and data arise from an absence of a systematic theory of cultural variation and from a tendency to rely too much upon mere empirical generalizations. The most casual observer is aware that the customs of different societies vary. He knows, too, that the behavior patterns of individuals within a given society are often markedly different. Indeed, when dealing with variation at this level we cannot but be acutely conscious of the wide range of individual difference. But it is not this plethora of specific content which is of the most critical importance if our aim is to understand better the relationship of cultural factors to either the structuring of social groups or the personalities of the individuals who comprise the social groups. It is rather the generalized meanings or values which should be our major, or at least our first, concern. Specific patterns of behavior in so far as they are influenced by cultural factors (and few are not so influenced) are the concrete expressions reflecting generalized meanings or values. And to the extent that the individual personality is a product of training in a particular cultural tradition it is also at the generalized value level that we find the most significant differences.

As Gregory Bateson has remarked: "The human individual is endlessly simplifying, organizing, and generalizing his own view of his own environment; he constantly imposes his own constructions and meanings; these constructions and meanings [are] character-

istic of one culture as over against another." ⁴ Or as Clyde Kluckhohn has stated, "There is a 'philosophy' behind the way of life of every individual and of every relatively homogeneous group at any given point in their histories." ⁵

The writer agrees with these and similar statements which emphasize the importance of value orientations in the lives of individuals and groups of individuals. There is in many of them, however, too much stress—implied when not actually stated—upon the unitary character of value orientations. Variation for the same individual when he is playing different roles and variation between whole groups of persons within a single society are not adequately accounted for. More important still, the emphasis upon the uniqueness of the variable value systems of different societies ignores the universality of human problems and the correlate fact that human societies have found for some problems approximately the same answers. Yet certainly it is only within a frame of reference which deals with universals that variation can be understood. Without it, it is not possible to deal systematically with either the problem of similarity and difference as between the value systems of different societies or the question of variant values within societies.

Human behavior mirrors at all times an intricate blend of the universal and the variable. The universals and variations are of many kinds. All human beings have many and significant biological similarities as members of a particular species, yet variability within the species is great. We frequently note both the similarities and differences which are psychological. We all recognize that men are alike in that they all live in some kind of social group, yet different in the kinds of groups they develop.

The universal and the variable in cultural values have not, as we noted, been so clearly distinguished. Students of society have sometimes tended, as did the evolutionists, to view all culture as a single whole unfolding through time; at other times they have held

⁴ Gregory Bateson, "Cultural Determinants of Personality," in J. McV. Hunt, *Personality and the Behavior Disorders* (New York: Ronald Press, 1944), II, 273.

⁵ Clyde Kluckhohn, "Values and Value-Orientations in the Theory of Action," in Parsons, Shils, et al., *Toward a General Theory of Action* (to be published by Harvard University Press in 1951).

to analyses within the framework of comparative culture and overstressed differences.

The problem of the invariant and variant in culture patterning can be and has been approached in different ways. Precisely which way, will depend upon the specific type of investigation being made. We are here interested only in a conceptual approach which will permit a systematic analysis of differences in cultural value orientations as these are held within a framework of common human—or universal—problems.

In a previous paper,⁶ I have presented a classification of cultural orientations (value orientations) and the beginnings of a theory of variant culture which I shall now hastily sketch.

The fundamental postulate is simply this: There is a limited number of basic human problems for which all peoples at all times and in all places must find some solution. The second stated assumption is that while variability is certainly to be noted in the solutions which are found, it is variability within limits, within a range of possible variation.

The five common human problems tentatively singled out as those of key importance can be stated as questions:

1. What are the innate predispositions of man?
2. What is the relation of man to nature?
3. What is the significant time dimension?
4. What personality type is to be most valued?
5. What is the dominant modality of man's relations to other men?

That the definition of human nature has differed from society to society should be obvious. We have only to look about us to recognize that there is considerable variability in our present-day American conception of human nature. The orientation we inherited from our Puritan ancestors is that human nature is basically evil but perfectible. Constant control and discipline of the self are essential if any real goodness is to be achieved and maintained, and the danger of regression is always present. But some in our society

⁶ Florence Rockwood Kluckhohn, "Dominant and Substitute Profiles of Cultural Orientations: Their Significance for the Analysis of Social Stratification," *Social Forces*, XXVIII (May, 1950), 376-93.

—perhaps a growing number—are inclined to the more tolerant view that human nature is a mixture of the good and bad. These would say that control and effort are certainly needed, but lapses can be understood and need not always be severely condemned. Such a definition of basic human nature would appear to be somewhat more common among the peoples of the world than the view we have held in our own historical past. Whether there are any total societies given to the definition of human nature as immutably good is to be doubted. The position is, however, a possible one and will, we think, be found ever present as an alternative definition within societies.

The range of variation in the man-nature relationship is again obvious if we give only a little thought to it. There are whole societies where the dominant tendency is to view man as subjugated to nature—the victim of his environment.

Another way of phrasing the man-nature relationship is to regard all natural forces and man himself as one harmonious whole. One is but an extension of the other, and both are needed to make the whole. Such was the attitude frequently found as the dominant one in China of the past centuries.

A third way of viewing this relationship is that of man against—or over—nature. With this view, which is clearly the one characteristic of Americans, natural forces are something to be overcome and put to the use of human beings. We span our river with bridges, blast through our mountains to make tunnels, make lakes where none existed, and do a thousand and one other things to exploit nature and make it serve our needs. In general, this means that we have an orientation to life which is that of overcoming obstacles. And it is difficult for us to understand the kind of people who accept the obstacle and give in to it or even the people who stress the harmonious oneness of man and nature.

Concerning the definition of the human being's place in time it should again be apparent that there is always a past to be reckoned with, a present time in which we live, and a future which lies ahead. No society ever does, or can, completely ignore any of the three time periods. Yet how greatly societies differ as to which of the three dimensions they stress or make dominant.

China of past generations (and to some extent still) was a society which put its main emphasis upon past time. The ancestor worship and the strong family tradition were both expressions of this orientation. So also was the Chinese attitude that nothing new ever happens in the present or will happen in the future. It has all happened before in the past. Thus it was that the proud American who thought he was showing some Chinese a steamboat for the first time was quickly put in his place by the remark, "Our ancestors had such a boat 2,000 years ago."

Many modern European countries have tended to stress the past. Even England, in so far as it has been dominated by an aristocracy and traditionalism, has voiced this emphasis. Indeed, one of the chief differences between ourselves and the English is to be found in our somewhat varying attitudes toward time. We have difficulty in understanding the respect the English have for tradition, and they do not appreciate our disregard for it.

We Americans, more than most people of the world, place emphasis upon the future—a future which we anticipate to be "bigger and better." This does not mean that we have no regard for the past or fail to give thought to the present. But it certainly is true that no generation of Americans ever wants to be called "old-fashioned." We do not consider the ways of the past to be good just because they are past, and we are seldom content with the present. This makes of us a people who place a high value on change.

The fourth of the common human problems is concerned with the valued personality type. The range of variation in this case yields the *being*, the *being-in-becoming*, and the *doing* orientations. Since it is assumed that all the orientations are an aspect of the action and motivational systems of the individual personalities, "valued personality type" is not the happiest of terms for designating this particular range of them. For the time being, however, we shall retain the term.

These orientations have been derived for the most part from the distinction long made by philosophers between *being* and *becoming*. Indeed, to a marked degree, the three-way distinction is in accord with the classification of personality components made by the philosopher Charles Morris—the Dionysian, the Apollonian, and

the Promethean. The abstractly conceived component which he labels the "Dionysian"—the personality component type which releases and indulges existing desires—is somewhat what is meant by the being orientation. His Apollonian component—the type that is self-contained and controls itself through a meditation and detachment that bring understanding—is to some extent the being-in-becoming. His active, striving Promethean component is similar to the doing orientation.

The accordance is, however, far from complete. As I have used the terms, "being and becoming," now made into the three-point range of being, being-in-becoming, and doing, are much more narrowly defined than has been the custom of philosophers. Furthermore, the view here is that these orientations vary independently relative to those which deal with the relation of man to nature, to time and innate predispositions. The tendency of the philosophers, writing with different aims, has been to treat these several types of orientation as relatively undifferentiated clusters.

The essence of the *being* orientation is that it stresses the spontaneous expression of what is conceived to be "given" in the personality. The orientation is, as compared with the being-in-becoming or doing, essentially nondevelopmental. It might even be phrased as a spontaneous expression of impulses and desires; yet care must be taken not to make this interpretation a too literal one. In no society, as Clyde Kluckhohn has commented, does one ever find a one-to-one relationship between the desired and the desirable. The concrete behavior of individuals in complex situations and the moral codes governing that behavior usually reflect all the orientations simultaneously. A stress upon the "isness" of the personality and a spontaneous expression of that "isness" is not pure license, as we can easily see if we turn our attention to a society or segments of a society in which the being orientation is dominant.

The *being-in-becoming* orientation shares with the being a great concern with what the human being is rather than what he can accomplish, but here the similarity ends. In the being-in-becoming orientation the idea of development so little stressed in the being orientation is paramount.

Erich Fromm's conception of "the spontaneous activity of the

total integrated personality" is close to the being-in-becoming type. He states:

By activity, we do not mean "doing something" but rather the quality of the creative activity which can operate in one's emotional, intellectual and sensuous experiences and in one's will as well. One premise of this spontaneity is the acceptance of the total personality and the elimination of the split between reason and nature.⁷

A less favorably prejudiced and, for our purposes, a more accurately limited statement would be: the being-in-becoming orientation emphasizes self-realization—self-development—of all aspects of the self as an integrated whole.

The *doing* orientation is so characteristically the one dominantly stressed in American society that there is little need for an extensive definition. Its most distinguishing feature is its demand for action in the sense of accomplishment and in accord with standards which are conceived as being external to the acting individual. Self-judgment as well as the judgment of others is largely by means of measurable accomplishment through action. What does the individual do, what can he or will he accomplish, are almost always primary questions in our appraisal of persons. "Getting things done" and finding ways "to do something" are stock American phrases. Erich Fromm also recognizes this orientation as separable from that which he defines in his concept of spontaneity and which we have called the being-in-becoming, but he seems to view it as mainly compulsive. With this I cannot agree. Many persons in our society who follow patterns in accord with the being orientation are compulsive; many are not. Conformity, which is essential in all societies whatever the arrangement of their orientations, should not be so much and so often confounded with compulsiveness.

The fifth and last of the common human problems treated in this conceptual scheme is the definition of man's relation to other men. This orientation, the relational, has three subdivisions: the lineal, the collateral, and the individualistic.

Sociologists have long used various types of dichotomies to differentiate homogeneous folk societies from the more complex ur-

⁷ Erich Fromm, *Escape from Freedom* (New York: Farrar & Rinehart, 1941), pp. 258-59.

ban societies. *Gemeinschaft-gesellschaft*, traditionalistic—rational-legal, mechanical-organic solidarity, or simply rural-urban are the most familiar of the several paired terms. Anthropologists, who have for the most part studied *gemeinschaft* or folk peoples, have frequently in their analyses of kinship structure or social organization made much of the difference between lineage and a lateral extension of relationships.

The distinctions being made here obviously owe much to the concepts used in both these fields, but they are not identical with those of either field. The lineal, collateral, and individualistic relational principles are analytical elements in total relational systems and are not to be confused with categories descriptive of concrete systems.

It is in the nature of the case that all societies, all groups, must give some attention to all three principles. Individual autonomy cannot be and is not ignored by the most extreme type of *gemeinschaft* society. Collaterality is found in all societies. The individual is not a human being outside a group, and one kind of group emphasis is that put upon laterally extended relationships. These are the immediate relationships in time and place. All societies must also pay some attention to the fact that individuals are biologically and culturally related to each other through time. This is to say that there is always a lineal principle in relationships which is derived from age and generational differences and cultural tradition. The fundamental question is always that of emphasis.

For some types of problems it may be sufficient to differentiate only between the individual and the collectivity. In most cases, however, it would appear to be highly important to know what kind of collectivist principle is being stressed. A society which places its major emphasis upon the lineal principle—as do, for example, Zuni Indians and some upper-class Americans—will have quite different evaluations of right and proper relationships from the society which puts a first-order emphasis upon the collateral principle.

There will always be variability in the primacy and nature of goals according to which of the three principles is stressed. If the individualistic principle is dominant and the other two interpreted

in terms of it, individual goals will have primacy over the goals of either the collateral or lineal group. When the collateral principle is dominant the goals—or welfare—of the laterally extended group have primacy for all individuals. The group in this case is viewed as being moderately independent of other similar groups, and the question of continuity through time is not critical. When the lineal principle is most heavily stressed it is again group goals which are of primary concern to individuals, but there is the additional factor that an important one of those goals is continuity through time. Both continuity and ordered positional succession are of great importance when lineality dominates the relational system.

How the continuity and ordered positional succession are achieved in the lineal system is separate from the principle as such. It does, in fact, seem to be the case that the most successful way of maintaining the stress on lineality is through mechanisms which are either actual hereditary ones based upon biological relatedness or ones which are assimilated to a kinship system. The English, for example, have maintained a strong lineality by consistently moving successful members of their more individualistic middle class into the established peerage system. Other societies have found similar mechanisms.

Thus far in the discussion of the major orientations our aim has been to show that different societies make different selections among possible solutions of common human problems. They raise to dominant position some one of the alternative principles. However, at no time has it been stated or implied that any society will or can ignore any of the dimensions. On the contrary, it is a fundamental proposition of this conceptual approach that all dimensions of all orientations not only are but must be present at all times in the pattern structure of every society.

However important it is to know what is dominant in a society at a given time, we shall not go far toward understanding the dynamics of that society without paying careful heed to the variant orientations. That there be individuals and whole groups of individuals who live in accordance with patterns which express variant rather than the dominantly stressed orientations is, it is maintained, essential to the maintenance of the society. Variant values,

are, therefore, not only permitted but actually required. It has been the mistake of many in the social sciences, and of many in the field of practical affairs as well, to treat all behavior and certain aspects of motivation which do not accord with the dominant values as deviant. It is urged that we cease to confuse the deviant who by his behavior calls down the sanctions of his group with the variant who is accepted and frequently required.⁸ This is especially true in a society such as ours, where beneath the surface of what has so often been called our "compulsive conformity," there lies a wide range variation. The dynamic interplay of the dominant and the variant is one of the outstanding features of American society, but as yet it has been little analyzed or understood. We laud or condemn the "melting pot" ideology, accept or reject what we frequently term the contradictions of our society, but do not examine carefully the processes which create that upon which we so readily pass judgment.

It is not sufficient to say, as we sometimes do, that an individual or group is different because as yet only a partially assimilated ethnic individual or group. Nor is it enough that we recognize the differences in socioeconomic status which make for variability in individual behavior. These are critically important differences, to be sure, and need to be known just as much as the more idiosyncratic differences which greatly effect but do not completely determine the lives of individuals—the particular family relationships, the broken home, the constitutional defects, or the personal catastrophe, to name only a few.

There is, however, still a broader approach to the question of variability which, if it will not tell all or even very much in some particular cases, will at least give us a more adequately delineated context within which to view particular cases.

We shall illustrate this approach in only three types of case. First let us take an example of ethnic differences, of which we have so many. The tendency too often has been either to view all ethnic

⁸ The writer is at present working on a theoretical formulation of the relation of variant and dominant value orientations. The significance of variant values in social stratification was discussed in the previously cited paper "Dominant and Substitute Profiles of Cultural Orientations." A next step is that of showing the significance of variant orientations for role differentiation in general.

groups as one undifferentiated whole or, in our concern to understand better the problems of particular groups, to seek out the quite specific ways in which they differ. We pay attention to the kind of parental authority, the attitude toward women, or perhaps delve into child-training patterns. These specific patterns are, of course, important; but it is obvious that knowing them all is in most cases impossible. Furthermore, when there is no general framework within which to consider the specific differences noted, there develops so frequently a tendency to attribute too much to single items of cultural content.

A second important point is that we should expect, on the part of individuals, whole groups, or parts of groups, quite variable value orientation adjustments. For example, we can find many Italians, many Irish, and many Spanish-Americans who are even more dominantly American in the value orientations their behavior expresses than are many members of the so-called "old Yankee" group. The fact that one is of old American stock is not at all a guarantee that one is a dominant American. We cannot, therefore, in this heterogeneous society of ours, hope to go far in an understanding of cultural value differences by seeking out and using nationality tags to define them.

This becomes vividly apparent when we turn our attention away from individuals or groups who are fairly pure ethnic types and consider segments of our population which are, from either an ethnic or an economic-class point of view, a melange. Though admittedly we should, and probably will, find greater variation both by ethnic and class groups, it would seem to be equally true that variation crosscuts both. American society (indeed every society, though ours perhaps more than most) both permits and requires in its role structuring adherence to variant orientations which is not confined to any such divisions as those of ethnicity or class. This variation may be in any or all of the major orientation areas.

In a study now in progress and as yet too embryonic to permit sound conclusions or warrant much discussion, variation of this kind has been a major interest. By means of both the interviewing method and a questionnaire technique an attempt was made to find out the differences in the value orientations of boys of high

school age. The sample of boys, chosen from a very much larger sample being studied in other ways, included a wide range of nationality origins.⁹ Socioeconomic status and intelligence quotient, judged on the basis of previously analyzed data, were approximately the same in all cases, however. The socioeconomic status was relatively low, and the I.Q. scores relatively high (ranging from 115 to 130). These boys, when tested by interview and a questionnaire on the basic value orientations they would express in critical choice situations, also showed significant variation. The sample was too small and the techniques as yet too imperfect for a firm judgment as to whether high achievement or low achievement is significantly correlated respectively with an adherence to dominant and variant orientations. The tendency would seem to be in that direction, though not consistently so for all orientations. This in itself raises the interesting question of certain qualitative differences in what we consider to be achievement. But the significant point for our purposes is that markedly variant orientations were expressed by persons who were approximately the same in both class status and intelligence level.

It should also be emphasized that variant individuals, such as many of these boys would appear to be, are only by exception deviant personalities and are not more often than others likely to be emotionally disturbed persons. Yet it is all too easy for dominantly oriented persons to consider them one or both. Recently when the author was discussing with a group of social workers a few of the cases where achievement and aspiration were both low in spite of a high I.Q., the suggestion was quickly made that they were probably emotionally disturbed or unstable boys. That differing values might account for much of the variation was just not considered.

Value systems are so often implicit rather than explicit, are so often unconsciously adhered to rather than held in conscious awareness, that all of us, whether we be educators, social workers, public administrators, or whatever, have difficulty in recognizing them at

⁹ The research project is a part of a larger project sponsored by the Social Relations Laboratory of Harvard University and under the direction of Professor S. A. Stouffer, Talcott Parsons, and the writer.

all. It is more difficult still to see that in many cases, and perhaps to some degree in all cases, a reason persons differ in their behavior, or create problems for themselves and for others, is to be found in the system of value orientations they either choose or are required to follow.

We would, it is suggested, greatly increase our understanding of the difficulties in the American mother-child relationship by giving more attention to the American mother's role as one of inevitable frustration for most mothers because of the value orientations it is expected to express. We can only comment briefly upon this important type of variation in American society. There are real problems for all American women resulting from the fact that as children and young women they are expected, even urged, to display the desires and behavior reflective of the dominant orientations of our society; then as wives and mothers, they are expected to behave in quite other ways. The individualism which girls are taught is so important in the schoolroom or on the job must be replaced, when they become housewives, by an emphasis upon collaterality. Their own goals must, or should, be second always to the goals of the total family group. The *doing* orientation they once followed is to be replaced by the generalized humanistic interests and pursuits of the *being-in-becoming* orientation. And only vicariously, through the lives of husband or children, can they give full expression to the future time orientation. Shifting between behavior patterns expressive of the same value orientations is not for most persons a difficult feat. A required shift to behavior which expresses quite different value orientations and for which the training has been slight is quite another matter. It is no wonder at all that many women, even when their will and intentions are of the best, find it almost impossible to suppress the resentments and frustrations which inevitably result from their being reared to express one system of values and later required to turn to patterns expressive of another.

It is hoped that with these few illustrations we have demonstrated the existence and significance of not only dominant but also variant cultural orientations. Other illustrations which would show variation in the value orientations in the many roles which a single

individual plays could also be cited. No individual, any more than a whole society, can live always in all situations according to patterns of behavior which reflect a single dimension of any of the orientations.

It is this dynamic interplay between the dominant and the variant value orientations which most analyses of cultural factors fail to treat. It has likewise been ignored, more probably unconsciously, by the many who work with the problems of individual cases within what is assumed to be a culturally constant situation.

Having a conscious awareness of cultural factors as important aspects of the total action and motivational systems of the individuals in different societies or subgroups is a first step toward a fuller understanding of individual personalities. A systematic conceptualization of the major and alternative cultural values (the dominant and the variant) and the relations between them is the second and necessary step.

To avoid misunderstanding I would emphasize that my aim has not been that of singling out cultural factors and forging them into a magic key. In some cases, perhaps many, with which therapists and social workers must deal, cultural factors, however conceptualized, may be quite irrelevant. In others, a knowledge of them may provide more true insight than could be gained from any and all other factors. Most often it will probably be the combination of factors which is needed. Thus we repeat that while we are still a long way from a real integration of the several conceptual approaches to the study of human behavior, that integration should be a goal for all of us whatever our particular field may be.

Fact-finding and Thinking as Tools in Policy-making

By EWAN CLAGUE

IT SEEMS TO ME to be symbolic and significant that the National Conference of Social Work, in a conference year emphasizing research and public relations, should have selected as its President a person who has spent a lifetime in research, teaching, writing, and public speaking. Certainly, the chief qualification which I possess for this high office is my experience over the years in analyzing and interpreting socioeconomic problems to the public. This year, 1951, is the twentieth anniversary of my first acquaintance with the field of social work. It was in January, 1931, that I moved from the Yale Institute of Human Relations in New Haven, Connecticut, to Philadelphia, where I became a research director of the Committee for Unemployment Relief and a professor of social research in the Pennsylvania School of Social Work. It was then and there that I was inducted into the profession under the tutelage of that inspiring Philadelphia group—Karl de Schweinitz, Kenneth Pray, Virginia Robinson, Jessie Taft, Betsey Libby, and many, many others. I could hardly have had a more sympathetic introduction to the field, or a happier association with thoughtful and imaginative colleagues.

It is significant too, I think, that the President of the National Conference this year should also be the head of a great research and statistical organization—the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor. The Bureau was established over sixty-five years ago by the Congress of the United States to collect and disseminate information on any and all economic matters which have a bearing upon the well-being of the working people of the nation.

The Bureau today is still functioning on the principle that fact-

finding and dissemination of public information constitute a useful and effective method of aiding in the solution of our nation's economic problems. So I have been able to bring to bear on social problems the experience and methods which have proved so valuable in a closely related field of work.

I wonder if it is not also highly significant that only a few days before the opening of the 1951 annual meeting of the National Conference, members of the staff of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, including myself, spent several days testifying before a Congressional committee on the work of the Bureau. The Education and Labor Committee of the House of Representatives recently decided to conduct a friendly investigation of the Consumers' Price Index of the Bureau, formerly called the Cost of Living Index. A subcommittee, under the chairmanship of Representative Tom Snead, of Oklahoma, was appointed to hold hearings on the subject and prepare a report to the Congress.

Social workers, as well as all other citizens, will be interested in that report. Many of you may want to study it when it comes out. This Congressional investigation is a vitally important phenomenon in a democracy—the representatives of the people want to know more about our statistics and their uses. Congress must decide whether the country needs a Consumers' Price Index and, if so, how comprehensive an index it should be. It will be helpful in that decision if Congressmen understand the index and its uses.

And now I have one last thought along this line. It surely is fitting and appropriate that at this very time the Bureau of Labor Statistics should have completed and issued the results of a survey of the salaries and working conditions of social workers as a professional group. I am sure that the final publication will be widely read and wisely used throughout the social work field. I must pay tribute to the splendid cooperation which the Bureau received, not only from the cooperating agencies and organizations, but also from the thousands of individual social workers who filled out the schedules. The staff of the Bureau's Wage Statistics Division say that they have seldom, if ever, received such wholehearted response from a survey group. Perhaps one of the incidental values of the survey will be the interest engendered among social workers in re-

search and statistics as a tool for the determination of social policy.

This study was initiated at the request of the National Council on Social Work Education. It was conducted in cooperation with the Council and with the National Social Welfare Assembly by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Federal Security Agency. In a broad sense, most of the country's social workers cooperated in the study; they made it possible by answering the questionnaire.

The cooperative aspect of the survey was an important element in its success. It had the advantage of combining the technical experience of government agencies with the resources and knowledge of professional problems provided by representatives of the social work group. The results of the study are based on replies from slightly more than fifty thousand of the estimated seventy-five thousand social workers in the country—a remarkably high coverage of so large a group of professional workers.

Preliminary articles based on the results of the survey have been published—one in the April, 1951, *Social Work Journal* and another in the April *Monthly Labor Review*. A bulletin showing complete statistical detail will be available in the summer of 1951.

Interest in this survey has been expressed not only by the social workers themselves but by researchers in the field, by community planners, and by industrial firms. Requests for further details are coming into the Bureau daily. The survey has also apparently stimulated some consideration of conducting further surveys on a smaller scale for individual programs. If this national survey has provided a pattern for further research on these problems, it may be of continuing value.

Why should I stress this point of social worker interest in research? Why cannot the place and status of research in social welfare, and in the social sciences generally, be taken for granted? Simply because research in the social sciences has no such secure position of public recognition and prestige. In this respect we lag far behind our colleagues in the natural sciences, who have achieved both.

Research in the natural sciences has come into its own during the past fifty years. It was not always so. History is filled with examples of neglect, frustration, opposition to, even persecution of, scientists

who tried to tell the public the truth about science. Pasteur is a famous name among educated people all over the world. His contributions to scientific and practical knowledge are well known. But is it not a sad commentary on his achievements that very few Americans have any notion that pasteurization of milk has anything to do with Pasteur, while in France, where he was born, lived, and worked, there is even today very little pasteurization of milk? And many other examples could be cited. How many of the world's great scientific geniuses died in poverty and neglect!

Within the last half century scientific research has reached new peaks of achievement and recognition. In business, in the universities, in government, and among the general public, research in the natural sciences has received vigorous support. In the business world there are many industries which are founded on scientific research, and in which the success or failure of a business concern is largely determined by the scientists and their laboratory technicians. The federal government has established the National Science Foundation to further the development of research in the sciences. Several years ago, when the budget of the Defense Department was being cut to the bone, no cut at all was imposed on research funds for defense.

While the rise of scientific research was well started before the Second World War, it was the invention of the atomic bomb which proved beyond question the value of such research. Billions of dollars were boldly expended on an idea, and behold! a new age was created—the atomic age. For, while serious efforts have been made by scientists to curb the popular hysteria concerning the bomb, the actual reality is beyond the wildest imaginings of the people. To those who have not read it, I recommend Laurence's book *The Hell Bomb*.¹ He is referring to the hydrogen bomb and he makes two key points: first, that the match or trigger to set off the hydrogen bomb has almost surely been discovered; and second, that under certain conditions that bomb could be used to destroy life on an entire continent. Laurence emphasizes that it is not necessary to do this, but who knows when some mad conqueror may chain the scientists to his chariot and elect to win a war that way.

¹ William Leonard Laurence, *The Hell Bomb* (Toronto: McClelland, 1951).

Of course, this is not the whole scientific story. Great progress has been made in discovering peacetime uses for atomic power. From the scientific laboratories there is flowing a steady stream of new discoveries—new wonder drugs, new plants, new sources of energy, new methods. Never has there been greater promise to humanity from science; yet never has there been a greater threat to human existence on this planet.

What has been the reaction of the scientists themselves to their own achievements? The tradition has grown up that scientists are cold-blooded, conscienceless people, human beings obsessed with a single objective—the discovery of bigger and better scientific truths. They have been characterized as being amoral and asocial. The performances of some of the German scientists under Hitler strengthened this view; it was a moral shock to the world to discover that scientists would experiment on other human beings.

But recent developments have made it abundantly clear that scientists are people, that they have all the strengths and all the limitations of other human beings, and that as scientists they have not lost sight of human values and social purposes. For example, the scientists engaged in atomic research have formed the Federation of Atomic Scientists, an organization which has not hesitated to express to the public the views of the scientists on the use of the atomic bomb, on international relations, and on national policy. Like other people, scientists are not all agreed on what ought to be done about the atom and its consequences. But they are clearly recognizing the relationship of means and ends, of methods and purposes, of techniques and values.

Curiously enough, even the activities of the traitor scientists, such as Klaus Fuchs and Bruno Pontecorvo, confirm this point. These men favored Communism, and so they chose to give away secrets they were pledged to keep. What this shows is that their loyalty was given to another society than the one for which they were working. It was another case of a scientist's values dominating his actions.

In passing, we might note that one of the frightening things about our recent experiences with traitor scientists, both great and small, is their mental, emotional, and moral instability. It has been ru-

mored that Fuchs in his prison cell in England is working on the hydrogen bomb for the British Government. Whether the rumor is true or not, it certainly would be quite in keeping with his personality as it was displayed during his trial. What are we going to do with a man who has such uncertain and fluctuating ideals and values? And think how startling are the possibilities in such a case. Is not this just the kind of mind which would chose to destroy a city or a continent in the whim of the moment? Such men are dangerous.

I hasten to add that natural scientists, just like the rest of the people, are overwhelmingly normal and completely trustworthy. They are planning our salvation, not our destruction. But we may have here a new social and political problem: how can we control the naïve, unstable, erratic minority who in the world of science may achieve power that threatens us all? This is an interesting and a most important problem, but I cannot explore it here.

To sum up the points I have been making so far, may I emphasize again: (1) that natural science research has achieved public recognition and status in our society; (2) that this achievement has been completely validated by the remarkable discoveries of recent years; and (3) that natural scientists have vigorously affirmed the essential unity of the social order by emphasizing their interest in, and dedication to, the values and objectives of their fellow citizens?

Let us turn now to the social sciences and to the progress of research in these fields. It is no exaggeration to say that in these matters society is in the Dark Ages. Social science research is not honored today; it even suffers considerable disrepute. While billions of dollars are devoted annually to natural science research, only millions (and not so many of them) are devoted to social research. (I wish to emphasize that throughout this discussion I am using the terms, "social research" and "social science research" in the broadest sense, that is, to include social welfare and social work, sociology, economics, political science, law, government administration, etc.). Nor do we social scientists seem to be making much progress in achieving public recognition and respect. What is the matter? Is the fault within our stars or in ourselves that we are underlings?

Yet surely there can be no doubt of the urgent need for progress in social science fields. The astonishing success of natural science is flooding over into social problems with which we are not equipped to deal. Look at just one small phase of the problem—the dominance of the machine in our industrial order. Wiener in his book on cybernetics² has hinted that before long we may be able to make machines which will produce goods more efficiently than unskilled human beings. He does not mean substitution of a machine for a specific job or occupation. He means the creation of robots which (when I wrote this I first said “who,” but perhaps we had better carefully reserve that pronoun for ourselves) could do all the work that a man could. Wiener wonders what society can do with the displaced human beings.

The fact is that the major unsolved problems of the world are economic and social. Surely there is little need to demonstrate this to social workers, but for the sake of the record a few illustrations may be in order. In international relations we have not solved our greatest problems. I am not referring to Soviet Russia and Communism—it is hard to live in amity with a group dedicated to conflict. But among our friends we are not doing so well, either—any of us—Americans, British, French. Through the Marshall Plan the United States has freely given billions of dollars to assist Western European countries in restoring their prewar economies and their prewar standards of living. We are now beginning to embark upon an even bolder program of world-wide assistance to backward countries. Surely we Americans ought to be easy winners in a world popularity contest! But we are not. We feel hurt because the countries and peoples receiving our gifts do not seem to be sufficiently grateful for our help; while they, on the other hand, are resentful of what they consider our patronizing attitude. Is not this a clear case of the need for the application to international relations of the interpersonal relations with which we are concerned all the time in social work? Social workers in the United States have participated in the establishment of the International Conference of Social Work. But have either we or our foreign colleagues done as much as we should in assisting our respective governments and peoples

² Norbert Wiener, *The Human Use of Human Beings* (Boston: Houghton, 1950).

to understand each other as these international aid programs develop and expand?

Even within national limits, the Western nations have not wholly solved the problems of government in a democracy. It has sometimes been said that in the science of government we have made no significant advance beyond Plato's *Republic* of 2000 years ago. This is a gross exaggeration.

Much has been accomplished in democratization, in education, in federalism, in application of government to a wide area. But government generally is in a sad state, both in actual administration and in popular esteem. Yet right today, what is more critical to our survival than effective responsible government? In fact, what is more important to the whole world during these next few critical years than an efficient federal government in the United States? Is our governmental machinery equipped to do the job required of us?

In the field of economics we have vast unsolved problems which have plagued us for over a century. We are rapidly forgetting the great depression of the 1930s but can we be sure that we have eliminated the wide swings of the business cycle from our economic system? And we still have with us the problem of an effective balance of produce capacity and income distribution. Furthermore, as I said five years ago, many of the economic policies we adopt in pursuit of our objectives are almost certain to produce results different from what we intended.

In our own field of social welfare, to what can we point with pride? We have not made an end to poverty and destitution; we have not solved the problem of rehabilitating and restoring social misfits; we are still far from having achieved reasonable minimum security for the individual and the family. Nor can we be sure that the security measures we are adopting will work out as we hope.

These are enough illustrations to make the point. There is urgent need for work in the social sciences, yet we lack both the resources and the opportunities to solve these broad social, economic, and political problems. What are the reasons for this failure? Can we do anything about it?

In the first place, in contrast to natural scientists, we in the social

science field are afflicted with too much heart and not enough head. It is news when natural scientists take an interest in human values. It is almost newsworthy when social scientists do a coldly factual piece of research on a hot issue. Our research tends to put much too strong an emphasis on objectives, goals, purposes, and much too little emphasis on untrammelled search for facts and analyses, no matter where these may lead.

This arises in part because of our intense desire to be practical in our research. Practical research is, of course, extremely valuable, but it tends to center on extremely short-run objectives and results. But, in the natural sciences, it has been the ceaseless search for truth for its own sake which has laid the foundation for many of our greatest scientific discoveries. In other words, research in the social sciences has been too narrowly confined.

There has, however, been even a worse consequence, namely, that we in social research tend to start our work with a sharply and narrowly defined objective. We are seeking to discover methods of achieving what we have already made up our minds to do. The consequence is that a great deal of our research takes the form of special pleading. We write economic briefs which make a case. Even when we do not do this, we are usually so eager to demonstrate the value of social research that we go out of our way to emphasize its immediate practical uses, again with the result that we are tagged as "do-gooders."

In the second place, this method of research is partially the cause of our failure to achieve public recognition for objectivity and impartiality. The public generally distrusts social scientists who never seem to agree on anything, yet who are very impassioned in their pleading for specific causes and policies. I myself am in a position in government, and am conscious of the general distrust which exists concerning government statistics—and all other statistics, for that matter. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has endeavored for over sixty years to demonstrate that a statistical agency can survive and maintain its status by issuing impartial and unbiased statistical information. Fortunately, the Bureau has been able to establish and maintain this reputation even under great difficulty. One of the greatest of our handicaps is the general distrust which people have

of statisticians in general, and of government in particular. No matter how unwarranted this may be in particular cases, it is something which must be overcome.

In the third place, there are natural limitations to social science research which handicap us in comparison with the natural scientists. We do not have the possibility of achieving an atomic success. In social science there are no laboratories where we can conduct our own experiments on the social order. In fact, there are no controlled experiments at all that go to the heart of any of our problems. Then, too, our achievements, such as they are, are difficult to recognize and prove. The most profound of economic truths may have already been set forth in some recent analysis, but it is difficult for the people to see the result. We have no proving ground where we can show the world the importance of the truths we have discovered.

Fourth, administrators in social fields are not well versed in the development of research and in the use of its results. This is generally true across the social sciences, but it is especially true in social welfare and social work. The emotional appeal in the field of social welfare is not surprising. Modern social work originated in the slums of London, in the efforts of socially minded, sympathetic people to better the conditions of their fellow citizens. Furthermore, because the funds to do this kind of work were raised by private gifts, there was an additional reason for appealing to the sympathies of the people generally. The objective was rather simple—an attack on the colossal, never-ending problems of poverty and destitution. The job was so big and the effort so comparatively small. Because of these factors, it is not surprising that social welfare, even when it has felt the need of research, has always emphasized the immediate urgency of the problems facing it.

And, so, throughout the decades during which a vast amount of progress has been made, there has been very little critical self-analysis of ourselves and our programs. We have been so conscious of the urgency of our services and of the needs of those we serve that we have seldom stopped to examine cold-bloodedly, factually, and objectively the consequences of what we are doing.

I should like to cite some concrete examples that will bring this home to us all. First, we have pressed vigorously our various pro-

grams of assistance to needy people without carefully examining the effect of this assistance on economic incentives. Periodically, throughout the years, the public challenges us, and even taunts us, with the fact that individuals and families get so accustomed to public assistance that they plan to live on it indefinitely. All of us, from time to time, have read about the spectacular cases of able-bodied husbands whose families have been supported for years to the tune of thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money, with no apparent success on our part in getting the family back to economic self-support. Of course, these cases are unique and unusual—we should have no trouble proving that. But the difficulty is that we have produced no effective answer to the challenge.

In the field of economics we economists know that we must have both supply and demand. So in the field of incentives there must be both rewards and compulsions. No economist can work from the demand side alone; and no social agency can confine itself to the rewards. When we enter the field of public assistance based on "need" (and I am using this term for the widest variety of social services), we are tampering with normal economic rewards and punishments, and perhaps seriously interfering with them. We need have no apologies for this; society has always reserved the right to modify the structure of economic life, to regulate it, and to interfere with it as may seem best. The important point is that the good resulting from the interference must outweigh the consequences of it. Furthermore, the interference itself must have its own guide posts and incentives.

To put it bluntly, we in the social welfare field have not worked out a program carefully adapted to economic life, one which dovetails with the economic system so that the two work smoothly together. I do not mean to say that a lot of thinking has not been done on this, nor that some good programs have not been worked out. I do mean to say that we have not done as much as we should in this most important aspect of our work.

Second, a still more concrete illustration of this point can be found in the problem of public assistance versus social insurance. For fifteen years we have made provision for an old age insurance program based on contributions. Yet we have also continued an

old age assistance program based upon need. The social security experts have emphasized time after time that some more rational relationship between these two programs should be devised, but so far the situation is still much as it was when the old age insurance program began the payment of benefits prior to the war. It is not surprising that, in the absence of an effective coordination of these two programs, all kinds of alternatives are being pressed as a solution. Nor is it surprising that federal legislators should be listening to proposals to put public assistance on a strictly state basis, without federal aid. This would, in all the poorer states at least, certainly cut down on the public assistance volume and payments. If social welfare administrators do not think up a better proposal, something like this may some day be adopted.

Third, the goal of social welfare work is the rehabilitation of the afflicted individuals and families and their reconstruction on a self-supporting economic basis. In principle, this goal can be supported by everyone. It is money well spent if some remedial and preventive welfare work will successfully salvage a disorganized family. However, our weakness is that we justify all our work on this general thesis, ignoring the fact that in one portion of the cases our work is highly successful, while in another portion we do not seem to be getting anywhere. We have not developed any wholly satisfactory criteria for determining (a) which cases seem to offer the best prospects of rehabilitation; or (b) with which ones we have been successful as contrasted with comparative failure in others; or (c) why we have succeeded or failed, as the case may be.

Fourth, social casework is certainly one of the key professional tools to be used in a social welfare program. Although I was never trained in social casework, I think I have a moderately good comprehension of its significance and usefulness. I certainly am a strong supporter of its extension to many more fields of social welfare. Yet casework has not been successfully demonstrated to the general public. In fact, to some extent, caseworkers shrink from having this particular technique examined too closely. Of course, it is difficult for a layman to understand just how casework operates, just as it is difficult for a statistician to explain to the public exactly how he uses various statistical methods. But there is both the necessity and

the obligation to prove that casework is an effective tool, just as the Bureau of Labor Statistics has to show that its indexes are useful in determining public policy. It is time that caseworkers started doing some writing for the general public as well as for each other. This is another area of social work in which there is urgent need for rigorous thinking and research methods. Caseworkers should be busy formulating criteria of success in casework and casting these criteria in a form which is amenable to objective testing. The recent study of the measurement of movement in casework, made by the Community Service Society of New York under the direction of Dr. J. McVickar Hunt, is one of the most promising and provocative in this field. This was an attempt to explore the possibilities of the use of measurement in casework. It is already opening up a whole series of questions for further study and exploration.

Fifth, the previous point leads me to comment briefly upon public relations in general. Certainly, the field of social welfare is suffering to some extent from poor public relations. Of course, there is a residual amount of public good will and appreciation arising from the valuable work which has been accomplished in social welfare over many decades. But as conditions change, and particularly since the end of the great depression of the thirties, there has been, it seems to me, a deterioration. Public thinking about our program has shifted, but we have not adjusted our thinking and our stress to the changed situation.

There is evidence in the National Conference of Social Work that social workers are beginning to do some thinking along these lines. For example, the Committee on Social Research and Social Studies scheduled a meeting on "Modern Methods of Measuring Attitudes, Opinions, and Judgments of the Public and Their Application to the Social Welfare Field." Out of this type of thinking and research should come suggestions for improved public relations.

Sixth, there is one other fundamental point which cuts across all the others. There should be a much closer relationship between social welfare research generally and the basic social sciences. Let me illustrate from the field of medicine. Medicine is now coming into its golden age in the remarkable discoveries which are flowing from

the laboratories and being applied to sick people. This fortunate combination began years ago when the clinical physicians established teamwork with the medical researchers. Social work is based upon a number of social sciences, but we have not yet established this teamwork relationship between the clinical workers and the basic researchers.

I am happy to say that here too there are evidences in the National Conference that an approach is being made to this problem. As illustrations I can refer to the group meeting on the "Application to the Field of Social Work of Scientific Anthropological and Sociological Principles Based on Recent Research" and to the several meetings on the "Implications of the New Knowledge about Individual and Group Behavior for Professional Practice."

I hope that this brief summary has reasonably proven my last point, which is that we have great need for research methods in the social welfare field. The next question I asked was whether we could do anything about it. I think we can, and I shall indicate concisely a few of the things that I think can be and should be done.

First, research must be recognized as a primary social welfare function to be supported and developed to the place where it is one of the key tools of our profession.

Second, research must be used by agency boards and executives, both in helping define the objectives of our various programs and in evaluating performance under those programs. There should be no shrinking from a critical examination of every program and every assumption. If we do not critically examine ourselves, someone from the outside will do it for us.

Third, this means the establishment of adequate research units in the various agencies—adequate in terms of funds, personnel, and status. By "status" I mean that the significance of research and its results must be thoroughly appreciated by those who determine agency programs and policies.

Fourth, we must develop better coordination between research and public relations. As a researcher I can speak feelingly on the subject that many valuable findings never reach the public in understandable form. I was fortunate in my own career as a researcher that I had intensive training in writing under a social worker who

was a journalist by profession. Research staffs can learn to some extent how to translate their results into readable public documents. However, in this field we should expect more effective help than we have been getting from public relations staffs, who must be trained to appreciate the significance of research results and to understand how to convert them into general public information.

Fifth, there are certain requirements for researchers which will be a great help in such a program. Barely to mention these, among the most important I would list: (a) technical competence; (b) unquestionable integrity; (c) ability to write for the general public; (d) ability to speak well before audiences; and (e) a good understanding of public relations. As time goes on it is to be hoped that our research staffs will acquire these general qualities in a high degree.

Here I should like to pay tribute to the new national organization of the Social Work Research Group. One of the most helpful developments in recent years has been the progress achieved in this field by this group.

For social workers, as well as for the nation as a whole, there is one lesson we must learn above all others: to continue to survive, we must learn to think clearly and to act on the basis of our knowledge. In scientific discussions throughout the world (except in Soviet Russia where the scientist must follow the party line) there is a minimum of emotional outburst and a maximum of appeal to logic and to reason. That is why natural science progresses so rapidly. In the social science field the great debates so often turn out to be an exchange of ideas such as, "You're a liar" and "You're another." Excess of emotion is not conducive to clear thought.

My message, then, is that we must think through our problems clearly and unemotionally; we must test our various programs from time to time to determine their success or usefulness; we must adopt research methods in arriving at our conclusions; and, finally, we must apply the results of research to the programs we have, and follow the conclusions to wherever these results may lead us.

I do not mean to imply that research and facts in themselves are the sole criterion of action. A little earlier I indicated that natural scientists felt the necessity for supplementing pure research with a

consideration of value judgments and social objectives. So, too, in the social sciences we should always expect to give adequate weight to these same considerations. Our problem is to get a better balance between the two by giving more weight to research and fact-finding than we now do.

One last word to those who may be alarmed at one import of this line of thought, namely, a fear that such a critical factual examination and such dispassionate thinking might result in the elimination of social welfare programs in whole, or at least in part. I do not think there is any such danger, although as a social scientist I would have to say that one never knows where the results of research may lead. It is my present belief, however, that the research program I have suggested would lead to sounder and better programs than we now have as well as to a more secure status for social welfare as a whole. My faith in this comes from a belief that in the long run truth will always prevail.

Past and Future in Social Welfare Research

By PHILIP KLEIN

AS I EMBARKED ON writing this paper I considered turning back for orientation to the paper which I presented at the National Conference of Social Work in 1948. Then I reviewed items of research that have occupied my attention in the last few years. Next I asked myself to what would I address myself and why if I had the power and resources to initiate or to promote research in social work.

It is not unlikely that your thinking in relation to research in social work is conditioned in much the same way as my own contemplation. I recall, for example, a recent meeting with persons interested in an institution in which children with cerebrosplinal palsy are being cared for, and for which it was proposed to raise a respectable sum for research on the effectiveness of the institution's rehabilitative methods. Presumably, the institution uses recognized procedures as fast as these can be learned. It is known, moreover, that there is a great body of unserved children presenting this ailment. The first question raised, therefore, was, as one would expect: Why spend money on research instead of on better service or on the many more children who require it? Then: What is there to research? Research is expensive. X number of children might be helped while we grope for things to research. Do we know specifically what we want to find out, or would it be just research in general? Moreover, why should *we* do this research? Why not this, that, or the other agency in the field? Or if somebody *is* doing it, why should we do it also? I shall not attempt to answer these questions. I am trying to create a feeling of the present atmosphere with respect to research in social work.

Take another example. An executive in a large agency, while

participating in a postgraduate class on social work research, introduced for discussion a specific operational problem with which he was faced and which his organization proposed to study, namely, whether a certain branch of his group work agency, absorbing a substantial annual budget, should be continued or abandoned. The interested parties obviously included the staff, the board, the central financing agency, the actual or potential clients. How was he to organize the study? What were the pertinent theories and facts? What were the professional assumptions? What weight was to be given to the opinions of influential lay and professional leaders? How should needs for service be defined and then how should they be related to the interests of sponsors, to resources, to unit costs, to theories of philanthropic or public responsibilities?

Quite a different light—though unfortunately not an unexpected one—was thrown upon the situation in connection with the deliberations of a committee of faculty members in an Eastern university on how to distribute a grant for research in the behavioral sciences that had been made available by a foundation. Requests for basic methodological research projects were solicited from social work as well as from other social science disciplines. Some of us in social work who have an affiliation with research were asked for advice. We complied. But either because of our ignorance, or because of the facts of the case, we found no articulated desire for specific research or for methodological study coming from, or clearly formulated by, those teaching technical social work, whether casework, group work, or community organization—no pent-up urgency for identifiable research projects was spilling over, seeking opportunities.

I have in mind, also, certain studies, published and unpublished, that have come my way. There are the Gluecks' latest book, *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency*,¹ and Dr. Sheldon's book on delinquent types,² both apparently savoring of social work which has active programs in the field of delinquency. There is Kinsey's well-

¹ Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency* (New York: Commonwealth Fund, 1950).

² William Herbert Sheldon, *Varieties of Delinquent Youth* (New York: Harper, 1949).

known book,³ which is not social work, but has a strong relationship with it. More strictly within our field are the studies on casework measurement by Hunt and his associates⁴ for the Community Service Society of New York; a brief study of the extent of success in a child guidance clinic; a study of my own dealing with types of group treatment (that is, institutional care) required for diverse types of children; and many studies relating to social security administration constantly appearing in the *Social Security Bulletin*. Then there are pin-pointed studies of local community needs, among which I mention Olds's study of the need for nursery care,⁵ because it has methodological and theoretical interest. There are the studies by the Commission on Community Relations which have some bearing on social work research, and there were a number of pieces prepared for the Midcentury White House Conference on Children which may be pertinent to our subject. At the New York School of Social Work we have prepared a tentative list of possible research projects, and I know that several other schools have done similar things in the same general field. Numerous special studies constantly appear, more or less local in character, like Alfred Kahn's study on truancy,⁶ in New York, the Philadelphia reports on marriage counseling, and so on.

I mention these works chiefly as illustrative of the atmosphere within which our discussions about research in social work are taking place, but partly also because I shall draw upon some of them with respect to certain points later.

Let us recall that if there is such a thing as social work research, it can exist only if we differentiate it from social research in general, that is, from scientific research in the social sciences. Of course, the two overlap; they are not mutually exclusive like well-behaved

³ Alfred Charles Kinsey, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (Philadelphia: Saunders, 1949).

⁴ J. McV. Hunt and Leonard S. Kogan, *Measuring Results in Social Casework* (New York: Family Service Association of America, 1950); J. McV. Hunt, Margaret Blenkner, and Leonard S. Kogan, *Testing Results in Social Casework* (New York: Family Service Association of America, 1950).

⁵ Edward B. Olds and Jane E. Biederman, *Day Care Attitude Survey of St. Louis* (St. Louis: Research Bureau, Social Planning Council of St. Louis and St. Louis Co., 1949).

⁶ Alfred J. Kahn, "Who Are Our Truants?" *Federal Probation*, XV (March, 1951), 35-40.

components of an orthodox classification. Social work itself may be the subject of scientific study, in which case it becomes the subject matter of historical, descriptive, or evaluative examination; it can be studied within the fields of interest of class and caste, of economic distribution, of politics. Social work research cannot be disposed of by simple reference to the fact that social work draws on many contiguous social sciences. Offhand, I cannot think of any social science that does not draw heavily on other sciences both physical and social. The fact, therefore, that social work research, like social work practice, draws for its facts and theories on other sciences does not constitute a uniquely differentiative aspect. I would rather distinguish social work research by the following postulates—in my mind, they are almost axioms:

1. Social work research relates always to the application of principles and theories. I emphasize application (in contrast to establishment or discovery) of principles and theories to specific tasks of remedy or prevention—these to be carried on by organizations either created primarily for such purposes or legitimately fulfilling such functions in addition to other primary purposes.

2. In so far as this application of services requires ascertaining needs for services or the study of conditions and problems that give rise to needs and services, there inevitably arises an area of overlapping interest between social work research and general research in the social sciences.

3. Operation of social services—that is, “application” in the sense used here—is always predicated on value judgments on the part of those sponsoring or supporting these services. These value judgments may be related either to the alleged needs or to the proposed goals. Like all value judgments, they imply choice or preference (rather than scientific validation), degrees of intensity in commitment to social values, differences of opinion as to values, and therefore a range on the part of sponsors, whether individual or communal, in selection of means toward ends.

I should add as a separate assumption applicable to all scientific inquiry, and one of enormous importance for all, that research has meaning only if it is made available to the field as a whole. A piece of research may be technically sound in all respects, but if it is not

published, especially as it relates to the social sciences, it remains only a piece of investigation or administrative control, or personal indulgence. It is scientific research in a pragmatic sense only to the extent that it is made available to the field of science in which it is conducted.

I have found it very easy to formulate these postulates. To me they are convincing, and I would have great difficulty in admitting that they are debatable. However, without details and specifications these postulates remain only pious, even though true. Since we are considering the future in the use of research in social welfare it seems imperative that these postulates be given substance and removed from the realm of allegation to that of useful discussion.

For this purpose I should like to consider first my second postulate. I would say that the task of identifying and assaying social needs amenable to social welfare operations is of necessity a joint operation between the social sciences and social work, with the latter in junior status. Whether this allegation leads to full-fledged interdisciplinary study or to specific partnership of stated sciences and of the particular personnel in a given study is a secondary question. Here, in the definition of needs, at any rate, lies the chief meeting ground of social sciences and social welfare.

From this very fact, however, have stemmed some of our dangers or even definite sins. We have tended to say, "Let George do it," instead of proposing specific partnership with George. For example, we have no counterpart in this country of Booth's survey of life and labor in London⁷ or of its sequel,⁸ and there is no recent counterpart of our own great Pittsburgh survey of 1907.⁹ Then again, even when some important research in our immediate field is undertaken, being diffident and often technically unprepared we hand the whole thing over to some other social science field or its personnel. There is, for instance: the Community Service Society

⁷ Charles Booth, *Life and Labour of the People in London* (London: Macmillan, 1902-3).

⁸ Sir Hubert Llewellyn Smith, *The New Survey of London Life and Labour* (London: P. S. Kind, 1930-35). Incidentally, it is noteworthy that York, Liverpool, Southampton, and at least half a score of other cities in England have been similarly studied.

⁹ Paul U. Kellogg, ed., *The Pittsburgh Survey* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1909-14).

study of casework measurement,¹⁰ which was originally inaugurated by Dr. Hunt's predecessors, who, like Hunt, were not social workers. The whole project was assigned deliberately, and with complete sovereignty, to Dr. John Dollard, not a social worker, who, after some three years' study, produced the so-called "D.R.Q." (Distress-Relief Quotient), which satisfied neither himself nor social workers. It so happens that Dollard, being a scientist, admitted the sterility of his formula as arrived at. But the enterprise was in any case one example of our running for refuge to other social sciences, not in partnership but in discipleship. In a way, this is true of the Gluecks' studies in delinquency as well, with results less extreme, but yet disappointing. And most important, perhaps, neither the Community Service Society studies nor the Gluecks' studies arose from the demands and initiative of professional social workers or in schools of social work. In the Community Service Society it was the board of directors; with the Gluecks, it was they themselves from within the academic atmosphere of Harvard, and upon instigation by Dr. Richard Clarke Cabot—a physician of far-sighted interest. The reliance on psychiatrists and psychoanalysts for research leadership in casework; the leaning on medicine and anthropology that offers us somatotypes for studies in delinquency; the almost complete abandonment of studies in economic problems to incidental work of the Social Security Agency and its correlated branches—these are other examples. It is no accident that some of the most important studies in estimating the need for various fundamental social services and their related social problems were conducted by the Work Projects Administration and later by other social security bodies almost entirely disassociated from the work of representative social agencies rooted in the private philanthropy of the past century. To sum up this particular phase: we tend not to be conscious of the importance of studying needs as a community phenomenon except as clients having needs arrive at our agencies; we do not seek and utilize neighboring social sciences in partnership to evaluate and measure need and to relate it to existing or to needed services.

¹⁰ Hunt, *et al.*, *op. cit.*

One curious effect of this tendency is an accumulation of safe and uncontroversial studies in the neighboring and relevant fields of study, and at the same time a curious aloofness from the findings in their fields. To the best of my knowledge, for example, juvenile delinquency is still the most traveled area for studies—on we go, study after study. And having studied, we do not gather our forces to work for real application of findings through social service agencies. Of the vast body of casework practice little finds its way into the juvenile courts, into probation and parole systems, or even into intensive therapy of problem children. We shall never do our research or our practice right until we concern ourselves with the study of needs; we shall never usefully study them by leaving the job to other social sciences, nor by depending upon their personnel for this important task. And certainly we cannot convert their findings into practice unless we take a partnership responsibility in the definition and estimation of needs and of suitable services required to meet them.

This discussion of the relation of social work and the social sciences in research relates to the second of my three postulates. We would all agree, of course, that anybody is free to choose his own standards of social values, to promote them, to establish goals in their attainment. We cannot on demonstrably scientific grounds disqualify as agency objectives in social work any social goals, even such unique goals as have appeared in many picturesque bequests for this or that exclusive type of orphan, or family, or aged, or ill. I assume, however, that we are concerned in social work research with those goals or choices that are extensive or generic in their distribution, that call heavily upon communal resources, and that reflect some universal social values so far as these can be identified by and for us in time, space, and culture, and perhaps particularly those goals that are related to technical competence, as we have been defining it in our increasingly professional practice. But no matter what our definition, the important point is that while social values in themselves are not subject to "research" for their validation, nevertheless we can justify our social welfare operations, or the research in their pursuit, only as we posit these values: it is these that define, create, and formulate the specific operational

goals, for a social work agency or a field of operation. It follows, therefore, that before we worry about techniques and statistics and strategy in a given piece of research, we should first make very clear to ourselves the basic value orientation of the service we propose to study. These values must be explicit and clear, at least within the time, space, and culture in which we carry on the operations in question.

There are value statements within this meaning that are so general as to be hardly useful for any specific and limited research project in social work though they be very pertinent to other, larger categories of research. For example, we would easily agree that no person should be permitted to suffer material deprivation when unable to provide for himself. Such a value statement would lend itself only to the type of research that seeks to establish: (1) are there such persons; (2) how many; (3) from what causes; (4) to what extent? Research, to answer these questions, would serve to establish a need. It would be primarily economic and sociological. If remedies are proposed, these would relate the findings to the science of government, politics, and only then to social welfare administration. The field of social work, a junior partner in such a study, would provide experience in administration and skill in the collection of data.

For our immediate purposes, dealing with the particular tasks of research in work as applied science, practiced through social agencies, our pragmatic goals must be more specific, more limited, more relevant to operation. As an illustration let us consider first the Hunt study. For the moment I am using this study as a peg on which to hang some comments on the importance of value statement as the necessary primary orientation for any study. The mandate addressed by the agency to the research director was "to determine and express how casework is carried on, at what cost, and with what success." Attention was given first to the manner in which casework was carried on.

The study was conceived as primarily methodological, and it is the best study of its kind yet produced in the profession. But, I do not see how a study of this type can serve the ultimate purposes of social work unless it sets up, by clear definition, the specific social

value or significance of the purpose which it is to serve. That purpose or goal must define why the service is given; that is, it must define the nature of a socially unconstructive situation presented for and justifying amelioration, and then the nature of the corresponding, relatively constructive or satisfactory situation which will justify discontinuance of service in a given case. Examining the Community Service Society project in this light, rather than from the point of view of the technical quality of the procedure, we find: that "casework" was interpreted as casework in certain selected types of cases in the Community Service Society; that it excluded, but without saying so, the individualized services in public assistance (including aid to dependent children); that it omitted casework as practiced in child placement and child guidance and as practiced for the aged; that it omitted the so-called "functional" casework; and that it omitted medical social work and the work of visiting teachers.

Even within the Community Service Society itself the study was concerned only with cases in which there were at least a stated number of interviews, even though these proved to be but 10 to 25 percent of the intake. In other words, the essential social value of casework becomes identified with the specific objectives of one type of agency, operating under a particular intake policy, relating to a small fraction of its own case load, conditioned by particular psychoanalytic and procedural commitments, and oriented to technical ends rather than to social needs. Yet the study addresses itself to the measurement of "casework" in the large. If these comments sound harsh and judgmental, remember that I am not speaking of the quality of the work, but of the fact that it is not oriented to a clear priority-demanding social value for social work. In devoting resources, skill, and competence on the scale applied to this study, there should have been raised and answered and weighed a number of questions, in my opinion, such as the following:

1. Is casework equated with attitude therapy?
2. Is individualized service other than therapy not casework, and is its measurement important as compared with attitude therapy; or is it different, and, if so, what definition would suitably differentiate the two classes?

3. Is casework as attitude therapy, and as practiced by the Community Service Society, different from psychotherapy and in what respect?

4. Is family casework an entity in itself, distinct from casework in the sense in which casework includes child guidance, probation, aid to dependent children, etc.?

5. If agency program rather than casework technique is studied and its results measured, should not the 90 percent of the case load receive prior attention? If, on the other hand, the multiple-interview treatment is the unit, should not that be the guide of selection, and should not its base be other than one agency or one agency type?

To sum up, this research is technique-directed, agency-directed, a sort of proprietary research, too removed from the kind of value setting that should characterize social work. I am spending this much time at this point on this particular project because its technical excellence and the magic aura that is still attached to family casework may lead to an uncritical acceptance and an unquestioning imitation—to the detriment of sound social work research.

A further fact is in some ways even more disturbing. Whereas the Hunt study was limited to cases having no fewer than five interviews, thus excluding 10–25 percent of the cases accepted, the casework to which the Community Service Society is oriented and which is characteristic of many similar agencies, the type of work for which its workers are trained, is that requiring fifty or more interviews—perhaps 5 percent of the cases accepted. This situation, so far as my impression is valid, is not uniquely characteristic of the Community Service Society, but rather a phenomenon pretty common to the body of so-called “family” agencies.

The proposed group work study previously mentioned is directly significant in the large perspective and immediately pertinent here. This study was suggested by a sectarian agency that does not actually exclude other groups from its services. At first, it seemed that the items for research were objectively technical. Relevant questions were: What is the population of the area? What are the age groups? What is the economic stratification? What other agency resources are available, including public schools? What minimum budget is practicable for professional services? Ac-

tually, however, the real issues could not apparently be frankly identified, and still less frankly stated. They were: Is the chief purpose of the agency to consolidate and serve the sponsoring sectarian group, or is it to serve the potential clientele of the area served by the agency? Is the need for developing potential financial support within the area for the central financial agency important enough so that the service will continue only if such support is advanced? Is the purpose of serving the clientele so directly sectarian that similar age groups of other ethnic or sectarian types would be outside the frame of interest of the sponsors to their virtual though not deliberate exclusion, or would there be merely an accentuation of service to the favored group? Would the central orientation of the services be consciously toward a special cultural goal, or to an American culture with added special interest? Is the primary purpose of the study to find and interpret facts, or is the study to be primarily an instrument for developing, improving, or "educating" staff, board, contributor, etc.? Again, I am not answering these questions. I am leading up to the general proposition that the careful and creative pursuit of methods suitable for social work research is lost unless the guiding values are clearly and honestly stated, difficult as that may be, and unless, moreover, these goals are directed to the larger issues whenever possible instead of to the specific agency policies alone, no matter how generic these policies may appear to be.

What is our past and what must be our future in the use of research in social welfare? Since judgment is involved, and arbitrary choice is inevitable, the details would appear more uncompromising than they are intended to be. I shall suggest, therefore, types of studies that are, I think, obligatory upon social work research proper, since it deals with application par excellence. They may not be the most important. They certainly are not comprehensive. They relate, however, to the first postulate, namely, that social work relates to the application of principles and theories, to specific tasks of remedy or prevention, these to be carried out by organizations either primarily created for such remedial or preventive purposes or legitimately carrying on such functions in addition to other primary purposes.

I think that social work research should address itself to a study of unit costs of service. I am not now concerned with efficiency, or with money saving. Too much of the contributors' money is being saved, as a matter of fact. But much of it may be wasted on relatively unimportant activities. Society must be given the data by which it can make the choices to which it has a right. Shall there be more day nurseries, more junior groups in settlements or schools, more intensive therapy for behavior problems, more marital readjustment, more special diets for the tubercular, more institutions for defectives, more care for the cerebro-palsied? We know perfectly well that we cannot do everything at once or do them all well. We are all special pleaders on principle, special pleaders before legislative appropriation committees, before budget committees of chests, and before foundations.

Does an interview with its necessary overhead cost \$3.00 or \$25.00; a place in a junior group \$1.00 or \$10.00; a per diem in a convalescent home \$5.00 or \$20.00; an educational pamphlet to, and a seat in, a mothers' club \$.25 or \$15.00? There are good reasons why we have been avoiding such studies; also less good reasons often for spending a great deal of time in figuring per capita contributions in a geographic area. For ultimately justifiable choices, based on social values, data on unit costs are indispensable. It is our business to make them and to relate them. I wish we would sometime study the issues, the methods, the problems, the experiments, bearing on this question. I have placed the study of unit costs first largely because I conceive of social welfare as a large and increasingly important phase of modern social and economic organization, far exceeding the limits of professional social work as conducted by traditional agencies, and as drawing upon our operational techniques far beyond the private agency structure which still dominates our practice and our outlook, our interests and our research perspectives. Therefore, priorities should be determined by factors beyond the limits of technical and special interests. However, the order of importance of these research fields is not nearly so important as their recognition, their pursuit, their inclusion in the basic demand upon funds and personnel, and their systematic planning on a supra-agency level.

I would put next in my research budget that kind of study of needs which is conducted more particularly within applied social science proper than in partnership with other social sciences. There are certain quantitative studies of need that can only be made by social workers, and within the field of social work, yet they require as vigorous a scientific procedure as anything in pure science, and therefore technical competence as well as operational technique.

One example is, again, the Community Service Society study for measuring social casework. I keep referring to this piece of research because of its obvious importance in many respects, particularly in that it is one of the most rigorously scientific undertakings in our field. It has established the very important fact that the judgment of technicians (in this instance of caseworkers) when properly prepared has a high degree of statistical reliability, and that, therefore, social work does have a strong, dependable basic instrument of research. The study has used the measurement scale, an important research tool, with reasonably good intrinsic success quite apart from the question of reliability. There are, I think, faults in the study that need further examination, as for example the validity of factors examined, the unweighted value attributed to factors of different importance, the addition of diverse factors like attitude change and environmental change, and so on. There is an inadvertently seductive bit of semantic legerdemain in the use of the term "scale of movement" so natural to caseworkers, when actually all that is judged is the change between two points of time rather than a continuum. Nevertheless, a piece of difficult technical research of high quality has been achieved.

Now that kind of technical skill should, to my mind, be devoted to the study of the relative distribution of needs of various kinds within the accepted area of social work activity, so that we may thence arrive at a priority scale, as well as a set of specifications as to which of the needs lying within the operational area of social work, and particularly amenable to its tools, should be attacked, how soon, and how extensively. This sort of study calls for some boldness in classification, both of problem and of treatment. It is not the type that appeals to the casework technician. But then it is not for the caseworker as such to decide what requires study. Even

within her own technical field, she rarely initiates scientific research of that kind. It is for the social work statesmen, who may or may not be caseworkers, to map the field and assign manpower, attention, and resources. Some adumbration to such a charting is implied, I think, in Dr. Hunt's proposal for "a systematic diagnostic classification of individuals who come to a family agency for help"—though of course he is still in the web of the family agency, looking through too small a window at too large a field.

This brings me to my second example of a study¹¹ of need that is strictly within the field of social work. This involved the provision of institutional care for children, an issue clearly within the field of social work. On the surface, the problem related purely to administrative and financial questions. Several sectarian institutions sought funds from the central financing agency for major repairs, plant improvement and expansion, possibly new institutions, perhaps research. A large sum was involved—over a million dollars. A consultant to the central agency was to offer guidance. Soon it became clear that for the best application of social work measures more would be involved than improvement or modernization of plants. A study was initiated to obtain data from which might be deduced: (1) whether, in the light of the best technical knowledge now available, the institutions in operation represented patterns of treatment in keeping with modern child welfare theory and practice; (2) whether additional institutional treatment patterns were needed to offer services of the kind not then being provided; (3) what quantitative provisions should be made in existing or in proposed institutions in order to offer care adequate in amount and variety; (4) what administrative measures were required to effectuate the findings.

To make possible these judgments, it was necessary to arrive at a precise definition of the types of institutional treatment deemed desirable by present-day knowledge; correlatively, it was necessary to define precisely what category of child problem called for which

¹¹ To this specific example should be added a subsequent but unfortunately unpublished, though tremendously important study of child care under the New York City Department of Welfare, and a study reported upon by Goldie Goldstein for Detroit: "A Community without Institutional Facilities," *Jewish Social Service Quarterly*, December, 1948, pp. 182-87.

type of treatment. Then it was further necessary to estimate not only how the current institutional census would be distributed among the resultant agencies, but also which and how many children there were requiring institutional care beyond facilities of the varieties of patterns identified. Here, then, was a study entirely within the technical area; need itself would be ascertained in terms of diagnostic classification as suggested by Hunt, without necessarily calling as yet for a more comprehensive study in which the partnership with other social sciences is called for. Yet this larger community-wide study is suggested by implication and would be a logical direction of further study.

In any such further study, whether that foreshadowed by the Community Service Society enterprise or by these studies on child care need, there would be primarily a demand for informed competent practitioners of social work and for a body of such practitioners who had, in addition, the knack and the training in research. There would be required, in addition, or "as directed," divers specialists such as statisticians, psychiatrists, physicians, educators, and perhaps others. The project would not be interdisciplinary; it would be social work research utilizing specialists from other fields as needed. As it then advanced into studying "needs" as a community concept, it would take on more and more of the interdisciplinary character, as the major contribution of other sciences was required in full partnership in planning and in execution.

For a third major field of study, possibly the most difficult of all, I would study results of social work. Let us put the question in this way: What is it that makes social work social work? Is it primarily the needs arising in our midst that call for certain types of remedy; or is it the skill and technique of the worker, the thing that makes him a professional technician? You can bring the question to an even sharper issue by asking: Does a person conducting private practice for fees as a professional practitioner do social work? Since private practice is conspicuously present in casework, the question, naturally, is interpreted as applying to private casework practice alone. But there are also many private camps, and a few institutions for problem children are conducted for profit. Do these do social work?

In seeking to answer these questions the contrast becomes clear between the practitioner's technique which may be bought and sold, and the need for services where the task is assumed by society as a social responsibility, at social expense, whether from taxes, contributions, or legacies, and where the services are in the main outside the sphere of availability by the purchasing power of the one in need of them. Is it, then, this social responsibility that makes it social, and, if so, is the changed condition of the client to be the focus of social satisfaction; or is it the quality and the specific contribution of the social worker as professional technician? In fact, our techniques themselves are a social product in more ways than can be discussed now, and in turn become a part of our social and cultural setting.

Applying this idea to the study of results, we see the importance of differentiating between what has happened in improving the situation of the client and how one can measure the specific effectiveness, to this end, of a technical method applied in the service. While in both instances it becomes necessary to guard against *post hoc ergo propter hoc* inferences, the issues are different, the methods of establishing results may be different, and the usefulness of the agency may be determined in a different manner. When the agency identifies itself as chiefly the conveyer of a technique or instrument, then the study of results in the client situation and the results of a technique may possibly coincide. This may be the case in a mental hygiene clinic, in a child guidance clinic, in a marriage consultation clinic. I think it cannot be the case with respect to a family agency, an institution for problem children, a relief agency, a social insurance department, a club in a group work agency, a playground, a social action agency. In this latter type of service the correlation between technique and result is much lower, and the social effectiveness of the agency may be best shown by the crude comparison of "needs before and needs after," or even in the form of quantitative auditing of services that may be regarded as automatically equated with results. We may, and I think we should, study results not only as related to method but also as tying up need with service, and procedures of study would therefore be

directed to a larger scope and to general facts as well as to technical minutiae. It is the difficulties of the latter that have blinded and deterred us and made us more narrow and more inactive.

This is, of course, necessarily a general statement, and its application for particular areas would have to be worked out in detail. But it is a point of view that may correct our choices in the study of results, our terms for stating their objectives, and our procedures for seeking them. It might even clarify the obscurities that arise from our too easy division of social work into casework, group work, and community organization, to say nothing of neglecting such ideas as promoting health, remedying or preventing economic destitution, and raising standards of living.

Next, I would spend money to keep a systematic record and survey of what was being done, with a constantly corrected blueprint suggestive of the areas under scrutiny, those yet to be tackled, results forthcoming from studies past and present, and new concepts requiring analysis. And I should certainly encourage for the entire field of social work, which is so loaded with its own jargon and the jargon of its neighboring fields, a study of the validity of concepts held essential for its theories and its work. Concepts would be released from the semantic integuments, exposed for examination, and validated so far as possible, in a manner somewhat like the initial attempt for the study of psychoanalytic concepts¹² made by Sears for the Social Science Research Council.

I would do all these things, or get others to do them, as well as other studies that someone else might place in priority—with certain conditions, precautions, and urgencies, such as, for example:

1. That we avoid fads and the obscuring effect of unnecessary jargon.
2. That we avoid discipleship.
3. That we avoid research that cannot be published and shared with the profession.
4. That we honestly avoid research when we do not know what we are looking for and why.
5. That we avoid that most insidious and dangerous caution so

¹² Robert Richardson Sears, *Survey of Objective Studies of Psychoanalytic Concepts* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1943).

inherent in social work psychology, namely, insuring acceptance by cutting the cloth and trimming the sails to the type of recommendations that might arise and might be agreeable to sponsor, worker, community, or supporter. Frequently it may be impolitic or futile to make studies, the results of which might be suppressed, distorted, or useless; never is it right to do so unless unfettered study and its publication are assured.

6. That we stop our provincialism. We should not assume that social work concepts pertain primarily to one agency, or one community, or even necessarily to one category of service. Whenever research addresses itself to concepts of significance to social work as a whole, let us think of it as being done for the field, and for all its possible beneficiaries.

I feel more enthusiastic about the possibilities of future research in our field than I did three years ago. Before my generation there was a keen sense of the need and use of research, and it was fruitful both for science and for practice. My own generation created and perfected practice, developed theory, and then got bogged down in its own practice and theory. There is now a new generation. Among them I see new competence, new light of adventure, plenty of solidity, better training than we had, and more faith in research. And meanwhile, my own generation is not quite dead yet!

Sampling for Research in Social Agencies

I. WITH LARGE CASE LOADS

By ANNE E. GEDDES and WALTER M. PERKINS

IT MAY BE ASSUMED that in public assistance research we are concerned solely with sampling large case loads. Actually, we cannot entirely escape the problems inherent in sampling small case loads. The 6,000,000 recipients of public assistance are aided under five different programs. These programs are administered by state jurisdictions in thousands of local subdivisions. Thus the large case loads break down quickly into small case loads. Here, however, our emphasis is on problems of sampling in studies that are national or state-wide in scope and thus deal with relatively large case loads.

The most effective use of sampling and the most meaningful interpretation of the resulting data depend upon a correct appraisal both of the limitations inherent in the sampling approach and the limitations that must be accepted. Perhaps it would be better to turn this statement into questions: Are there disadvantages in studying all the cases? Should we always consider first whether it is possible to schedule all existent cases? Should we reluctantly accept the alternative of sampling only when a complete enumeration is out of the question, or are there occasions when we should say that even if time and money permit an examination of all the cases, a sample study is better?

Many people try to avoid sampling because a sample is inevitably associated with sample error, and "error" is a horrid word. Although statisticians talk of establishing tolerance limits for sample error, other people feel strongly that no errors can be tolerated.

It should be generally understood that "sampling error" is only the allowance for chance variation from sample to sample, so that one can have error and yet no mistakes.

It is probable that confusion between sampling errors and mistakes makes it difficult to accept the fact that we do not escape sampling errors by making complete enumerations. From a simple accounting point of view an accurate enumeration of all existing cases will supply a set of figures which can be presented with confidence. Just as soon, however, as these figures are looked at with an eye to interpretation, the complete enumeration becomes a sample. For it is only by visualizing how different the results could have been with another group of cases developed under the same conditions, that we can distinguish between real differences and differences that may be due to chance alone. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that for purposes of research 100 cases randomly selected from 100,000,000 form just as reliable a base as would the 100 cases if they represented a complete enumeration of all the cases on the rolls.

A complete enumeration, of course, avoids the problems involved in the selection of cases; and at times this is an important practical consideration. Otherwise, however, our original questions have boiled down to the relative advantages of larger versus smaller samples. In other words, is the larger sample always to be preferred, subject only to the limitation of the number of existent cases or the time and funds available for the study?

Our answer is, unequivocally, "no." If sampling error were the only kind of error to be found in research studies, the larger sample would inevitably be more reliable—assuming the sampling method to be the same. Even under these conditions, however, the size may reach the point beyond which the further increase in reliability cannot be justified by the increased cost.

Because inevitably there are errors in public assistance research that are not attributable to sampling, it has been our repeated experience that a very large sample or a complete enumeration may be not only more expensive, but also less reliable and less useful. This experience only bears out what has been found in other fields of research, namely, that there are times when the sample should

be used as the check of the reliability of the complete enumeration rather than the complete enumeration as the test of the sample.

In speaking of nonsampling errors, we are, of course, primarily referring to the mistakes that may occur during the research process—mistakes in the information originally given, in recording, in coding and tabulating. Repeatedly, we have known a state public assistance agency to undertake a complex study on the basis of complete enumeration because the agency was skeptical of sampling errors, only to have it acknowledged later that the data obtained were distinctly inferior in value to the results that would have been yielded by a sample. There is, of course, no magic in the sample as such; the advantage arises from the simple fact that keeping the number of cases scheduled within reasonable proportions permits sufficient care in recording and checking to minimize mistakes. A further advantage comes from the fact that the sampling error permitted can be computed and allowed for, while the unreliability of data arising from mistakes can ordinarily only be surmised.

In addition, the large sample has a bigger time error. The administrative usefulness of most of our research lies in its applicability to the current case load as contrasted with the case load at the time of the study. Since the characteristics of the public assistance programs tend to change with the passage of time, it follows that in so far as a larger sample requires more time before the results are available, that sample tends to be less representative by the time the data are ready for use.

Many special problems arise in sample studies that are not encountered when all cases are studied. Among the most difficult is that of interpreting extremes, ranges, and rarities in the data. The extremes in age, amount of assistance, family size, or other attribute may fall somewhat short of those known to exist. For example, the rare ten-child family upon which public attention has been focused may not appear in the sample. If the most extreme items are not selected, the range is obviously narrowed. Even though the sample results may give an approximate picture of the facts and may supply an adequate basis for inference, the administrator, the caseworker, or other consumer may tend to discount the results if an unusual situation which has been in the spotlight does not appear.

As a matter of fact, even in a complete enumeration the extreme cases may not show the full range of what is possible under existent standards. For example, in a state providing hospital care to needy persons, assistance payments in a given month may range from one dollar to \$357. Yet it cannot be concluded that the \$357 payment represents a maximum; next month the top may be \$450 or even more.

Every sample study presents problems of design and control. In designing each sample, consideration must be given to the nature of the inquiry, the amount of detail desired, and the degree of chance variation that can be permitted. It is possible at times from an examination of a schedule to get a general idea of the type of analysis and detail of treatment to be given the data and thus to develop a rough-and-ready sampling plan. The most efficient sampling design, however, can be drawn up only with specific knowledge of how the data are to be used. The technician responsible for making an efficient design can have a salutary effect on the planners of schedules by stressing the importance of at least preliminary tabulation plans as a prerequisite to formulating the sampling plan. The sampling man, furthermore, should not be satisfied with a plan that consists in a mere mechanical crossing of each item in the schedule against every other item. Sampling techniques demand a higher quality of planning than generally prevails in inquiries conducted on a mass scale.

Before specifications are developed we must come to grips with fundamental questions: Will regional and national data be adequate? Is state detail essential? How much cross-classification and how much subclassification at each level are necessary? To some extent, the planning of the study and of the sample interact, since the cost of obtaining data for a sample large enough to support the tabulations originally contemplated may require reconsideration of the necessity for getting all projected cross-classifications.

Almost any study is designed to illuminate a number of questions. It is hardly feasible to work out the sampling error for each question. Therefore, we have adopted a rule of thumb for judging whether the projected sample size will support the contemplated plan of analysis. We arrive at the minimum number of cases needed

by taking our most detailed table and multiplying the number of cells in the table by twenty-five. If we are to cross a ten-way breakdown with a ten-way breakdown, for example, the minimum sample would be 2,500 cases. This standard, which applies to sub-classifications within a table as well as to the table as a whole, has forced us to make many compromises, especially with respect to local detail. A plan calling for any appreciable amount of local analysis can quickly expand a national sample beyond manageable proportions. For this reason, the small state may find itself contributing only to the national or regional picture and producing little or no information useful for its own guidance. Seldom can a national study, conducted on a sample basis, consider getting useful data for individual counties, although it may be feasible to get data that are significant for a few large counties or for homogeneous groupings within a state. It may be difficult for some of the smallest states to schedule enough cases to yield data that are significant; on the other hand, a state's interest in investing the necessary time and effort in training staff to produce a relatively small number of schedules to contribute to the national picture may be understandably lukewarm.

In federal-state programs, a basic tenet is that states should be permitted as much latitude as possible in developing procedures that will enable them to meet federal standards. This is necessary in considering sample design because state programs differ so much in organizational patterns that a sampling plan economical in one state may be costly in another. For this reason, we try in developing over-all plans either to keep them simple, or else to offer the states some alternative methods.

We should have great difficulty in conducting studies on a sample basis without a staff of regional research analysts to work with state research staffs on the adaptation and control of sampling plans to prevent bias. In this connection we have had some problems in convincing the states of the importance of including in the sample only those cases and counties selected. Considerations of sampling theory may not be persuasive to a state administrator who has two counties that appear to him to be similar except that in the county selected the conduct of the study would be difficult, whereas in the

other it would be relatively simple. In our early sampling studies, we were under pressure to permit substitutions. On the one hand, we have tried to consider the administrative problem in so far as possible; on the other hand, the states are now exceedingly cooperative in conducting the study in the areas selected by the sampling plan.

Sampling methods open up possibilities for research that do not exist when all information is obtained on the basis of complete coverage: resources can be spread farther, and more penetrating research can be conducted.

The economies in sample studies in recording and processing data do not need much discussion. Obviously, less staff time is required to fill schedules for a small percentage of case load than for all cases. Similarly, the checking, editing, coding, and tabulating of a relatively small number of schedules is less time-consuming.

A point meriting more discussion is the possibility afforded by sample design of controlling the burden of special studies for local agencies and workers. Relatively simple sample studies may be conducted with least disruption of the routine work of the agency if the scheduling of cases is spread among all workers in all counties. On the other hand, in studies that require a considerable amount of staff training it may be most economical to limit the number of workers and have them carry the burden of the study. For this purpose, it may be desirable to limit the number of participating counties.

The sampling of counties produces larger sampling errors than a state-wide sampling of cases. In some of our studies we have adopted a method of selecting counties with probability of selection proportional to size of case load. We have been well satisfied with the reliability of the results. The great advantage is that there is little or no chance of omitting any county having a sizable proportion of the total case load. On the other hand, we can reduce considerably the number of small counties that need to be involved. Despite the fact that more of the large than of the small counties are selected, we are able to make the sample self-weighting by selecting differing proportions of cases in large and small counties.

The usefulness of sampling is not confined to special studies, but

should be considered in periodic reporting as well. Some states with large case loads are now using sampling in preparing a report on the number of recipients in each category receiving payments in each dollar interval in one month of each year. We are now developing a plan for a periodic report on the overlap between assistance and old age and survivors insurance that we hope can be prepared on a sample basis in most states. Although, traditionally, periodic reporting has been on the basis of complete coverage, there is no reason why the same considerations that govern sampling for special studies should not be applied to periodic reporting: What are the uses of the data? How reliable do the data have to be? How many cases are needed to provide this degree of reliability?

The Bureau of Public Assistance and state public assistance agencies have frequent need for simple information that may not be available in periodic reports and cannot be satisfactorily supplied through occasional special studies. To meet this problem, the Bureau and a number of state public assistance agencies have been experimenting with the "permanent" sample, which consists of a portion of the cases set aside for repeated use in obtaining information on the characteristics of the total case load. Once in the sample, the case remains as long as assistance is continued. The sample is maintained over time, with continuous adjustment for cases closed and opened. The problem of determining which open cases to include is solved by allowing the final digits of the case number to form the basis of separating the permanent sample cases from the rest of the case load. Before the case number endings were used as the basis of sampling, the states did experimental work to test the hypothesis that such selection gives random results.

The permanent samples are small, sometimes not more than one or 2 percent of case load. The Bureau has recommended that no state use a permanent sample of less than four hundred cases. For the cases included in their permanent sample, some states continuously maintain a body of information in the state office, so that at a moment's notice the data may be tabulated. Some states request local offices to supply data as needed for the permanent sample cases. Other states use a combination of the two approaches.

Permanent samples are frequently used to determine the effect on coverage and cost of a program of a given standard or policy.

For purposes of establishing trends in the characteristics of recipients, a permanent sample is markedly superior to samples independently selected in successive periods. The core of cases adds stability to the data. The less the case turnover in a program, the greater the advantage of permanent sampling, both from the point of view of economy and of elimination of chance fluctuations in trend analysis. Although the permanent sample is a valuable tool, it cannot and is not intended to eliminate the periodic report and the special study as sources of data.

Only when sampling techniques are used is it feasible to conduct studies that are designed to illuminate complex problems. When concepts must be precisely defined, data assembled from numerous sources, and exacting procedures for editing and coding schedules prescribed, the number of cases must be held at the rock-bottom minimum consistent with yielding reliable answers to the questions posed. Moreover, when the number of cases studied can be held down, techniques can be used that would be unthinkable on a mass basis.

A year ago when intensive Congressional consideration was being given to the relative roles of old age assistance and old age and survivors insurance (OASI) a study was made, jointly by the Bureau of Public Assistance and state public assistance agencies, of the status of recipients of old age assistance in relation to OASI. The purpose was to supply a basis for estimating the effects on old age assistance of liberalization of the benefit formulas and extension of coverage to the noncovered groups under amended legislation. A sample of approximately seven thousand cases was selected from among recipients on the rolls one year. In most states the sample cases were selected in sample counties.

After the entry of certain information, local offices sorted the schedules into two groups—those for recipients also receiving OASI benefits and those for recipients not receiving benefits. Local public assistance offices sent the first group of schedules to local OASI field offices where information regarding the benefits was

entered. These schedules were then returned to the local public assistance offices for completion. On the other hand, for recipients ineligible for benefits, the schedules were sent by local public assistance offices to the state public assistance office which in turn sent them to Washington for screening through the wage records of the Bureau of OASI. Information regarding experience in covered employment, if any, was entered. The schedules then were returned to the state public assistance agencies and thence distributed to appropriate local offices for completion.

The employment history of recipients from 1937 to 1950 was reconstructed by means of personal interviews. For recipients ever in covered employment the OASI wage information supplied a point of departure. The study plan required a rigorous adherence to a tight timetable. Despite the peripatetic procedure and the large number of participating offices the recording went off like clockwork, and not a single schedule was lost. Such an involved and highly controlled procedure would fall of its own weight unless applied to a relatively small sample. The study has yielded data that will be useful both to states and to the Social Security Administration in interpreting the effects of limitations in OASI on old age assistance.

We have recently introduced a study to be conducted on a sample basis of the social and medical characteristics of recipients of aid to the permanently and totally disabled. This study will provide detailed information for some twelve thousand recipients under the new state programs established under the 1950 Social Security Act amendments. Such information as age, sex, ability to get about, services needed in daily living, diagnoses of impairments, medical services received and recommended, relationship to the program of vocational rehabilitation, and recent employment status are needed in an early stage in order that appropriate planning may be done with other agencies providing medical, rehabilitation, and other services. In this study, information on the diagnoses of impairments is drawn from the medical records on the basis of which the individual has been found permanently and totally incapacitated. The diagnostic data are to be coded in accordance with the "Inter-

national Statistical Classification of Diseases, Injuries, and Causes of Death," with certain auxiliary codes for residual defects resulting from diseases and injuries. To equip state personnel to draw the appropriate information and to code the information is requiring an intensive training program. The data, which could be obtained from all states only on a sample basis, should prove valuable to state agencies and to the Social Security Administration in understanding, interpreting, and solving the special problems inherent in the new category.

It should be apparent that we hold that modern methods of statistical sampling should be considered in relation to all research questions concerning large case loads. This is not equivalent to saying that research regarding public assistance case load has value only if based on a valid sample. Many important hypotheses and original concepts have been formulated on the basis of intensive study of a few cases that made no pretense of being a statistical sample. We believe, however, that if such hypotheses and original concepts are to be proved or disproved, they must be tested by means of studies that make full use of statistical sampling theory, either in selection or—if full enumeration is followed—in interpretation.

We recognize that we have only begun to capitalize on the potentialities of sampling in studying public assistance case loads. We need to determine the reliability of certain sampling methods. For example, it would add appreciably to the economy and usefulness of some of our studies if we could select our samples from cases re-investigated in a given month. Since workers commonly make a home visit at the time of reinvestigation, they could then get information for study purposes that would not otherwise be available. Unfortunately, we do not know how representative such samples would be.

As we see it, sampling has potentialities in administrative research as well as in the study of the characteristics of recipients. We have already made some applications of sampling in time studies. We are only beginning to explore the possibilities of sampling research as a basis for establishing standards for the quantity and the

quality of the work to be done. We believe that the techniques developed in statistical quality control may be of assistance in working toward this goal.

Even though we recognize the applicability to the field of public assistance of techniques developed for sampling opinion, we have done no work in this area. We should be concerned not only with public attitudes toward the basic issues of public assistance, but also with the attitudes of recipients and of local workers.

Developments in sampling theory and in practical applications have been extremely rapid in recent years. Social work has lagged in capitalizing on sampling techniques. In research concerning large case loads there is no possibility of escaping sampling procedures, nor should there be any will to do so. As we have already pointed out, even when entire case loads are studied, considerations of sampling enter in. If we concede the pervasiveness of sampling, we must then take into account its implications for education for social work research. Persons now being trained for research in social work need better grounding in statistics, and especially in the philosophy of sampling, than generally prevails among social work researchers. If the schools of social work are to equip students to conduct research that is imaginatively conceived and calculated to illuminate the complex problems of social work policy and practice, the schools must raise their sights with respect to education for research. Like the old-school physicists, the old-school researchers in social work will have a high obsolescence rate in the next decade.

II. WITH SMALL CASE LOADS

By BERTRAM J. BLACK *and* CHARLES P. GERSHENSON

EVERY GOOD ADMINISTRATOR AND SUPERVISOR of a social agency is involved in sampling a good part of the time. In a somewhat loose sense, every time a piece of the agency's case load is ex-

amined for whatever purpose and the findings from this examination are generalized to the total agency load, the process of sampling has been involved. The same is true when the supervisor reads a sample of her workers' records to decide upon the quality of the work, to prepare for personnel evaluation, or simply to answer some question as to characteristics of clientele which has been posed by her administrator, board, or community. That these are samples in the popular sense is true, but that they constitute samples in the statistical sense is open to serious question.

While our principle concern is with the problems of sampling of small case loads, it must be recognized that sampling is only a part of a research study. While not all research studies need be concerned with sampling, all discussion of sampling should be within the framework of the research study unless presented didactically by the teacher or worked with creatively by the mathematical statistician.

With the development of modern statistical techniques there are available a variety of sampling procedures suitable for practically any type of question regarding the case loads of social agencies. The limiting factor is not a method of sampling but rather the problem of study design and the lack of objective instruments to measure the various aspects of casework, group work, or psychotherapy.

In designing a research study, the research worker must make certain initially that there is utmost clarity as to the question under investigation. This, perhaps, is one of the most difficult parts of a research study in the social work field. There is a prevalent feeling that this clarity will "work its way through" or "evolve in the process" of the investigation. What actually evolves is frustration rather than clarification.

For example, the general problem under consideration might be an analysis of services rendered children by a family casework agency. If one were to accept this statement of the problem as definitive, without further clarification, any selection of case material for analysis through sampling or otherwise would lead only to confusion. What children are we referring to as those who are given service—just those children who have direct face-to-face contacts

with the caseworker, who are accepted as the primary case? Or do we mean all children in families from which some member is receiving individual attention by a caseworker of the agency? What do we mean by "service"? Is this limited to assistance with the emotional problems of the child, or may we include indirect services provided through assistance to the family wage earner or housewife, or do we also include assistance in adjusting schoolwork or other environmental manipulation?

The formulation of the problem in a definitive manner necessitates specifying the purposes of the study. If the purpose of the problem just mentioned is to determine the characteristics of children to whom the agency gives a direct casework service, the question takes on a specificity which defines in great part the population from which a sample might be drawn. And this population, it may be clearly seen, will be very different if the purpose is defined as the determination of the characteristics of all the children in the families served by this casework agency.

A decision has to be made in advance as to the nature of the information to be collected. It is at this critical point that research is severely limited, as mentioned previously, by the unavailability of suitable instruments to measure the dynamic rather than ecological aspects of social work. For the problem just described there will need to be a classification of characteristics of children both in terms of the problems presented to the agency by them or their families and the nature of the services rendered. In neither of these areas are there as yet adequate, reliable, and valid descriptive measuring rods.

The unit of count, more often referred to as the "sampling unit," must be clearly defined. This sampling unit may consist of a single individual, or a family, or a case record, or an agency. Generally, the smaller the sampling unit employed, the more accurate and representative the results. For example, in a survey of the case loads of family agencies it will be more accurate to take 5 percent of all the cases in each agency than to take all the cases in 5 percent of the agencies. In the recent national survey of salaries and working conditions in social work positions it would have been more accurate to have taken a smaller proportion from each county in the United

States than a higher proportion from a selected number of counties. But to do this would have entailed a large increase in administrative effort and expense. It is more accurate to take a smaller proportion of cases from the case loads of all the workers in an agency than to take a larger proportion from a few selected workers on the staff.

The unit of sampling is not necessarily the event or the item in which the investigator is interested. The event may be an emotionally disturbed child, while the sampling unit may be a school, agency, or household. The best unit of sampling is, of course, the event itself, but it may not be administratively feasible to use. In our example, while the item to be investigated is the child, the unit for sampling would be the family case.

Another example of this concept of the sampling unit as distinct from the item being studied is an examination of the correlation between incidence of separation anxiety in preschool children and placement of the child in a nursery school. Since each day brings with it the separation of the little one from his mother at the door of the nursery school, any one child may represent over a period of time a number of items or events of separation which may be subjected to psychological study. The unit of sampling, however, must of necessity be the child.

Once the sampling unit has been decided upon, the investigator comes to grips with the method of sampling itself. Sampling is used with the intent of obtaining accurate results with a great economy of effort. There are also other advantages to sampling. At times, more accurate results are obtained from a sample than from the complete population. When using the entire population it is more difficult to check the nonrespondents than when using a sample. Secondly, it is possible to obtain more detailed information by using a sample. In addition, the collection and analysis of the data take much less time for a sample than for an entire population.

Practical convenience is as important as relative accuracy of different methods when choosing a sampling procedure. The most suitable method will depend very much on the type of information that is already available on the population to be sampled. Two types of situation usually prevail: all the sampling units may already be catalogued or on file with some information known of the

population; or no such file may exist and very little may be known about the population. Usually, within the framework of the agency with relatively small case load, the former situation will prevail. In most studies attempting to measure the need for services of the general population of a specified area the latter situation will be the more common one.

The accuracy with which the sample will reflect the total population is contingent upon two different types of error: random sampling errors and errors due to bias. The random errors can be adequately handled by the mathematics of sampling theory, while errors due to bias can only be evaluated by a careful investigation of the sampling method. Recently, a large public department, providing financial support for group work activities in private agencies, attempted to measure the effectiveness of the group leaders. To accomplish this task the group leaders were given forms relating to the status of the group at initial contact and again at a later time in the progress of the study. The specific instructions to the group leaders, who were responsible for up to six groups each, left it to the group leader to select any one of his groups for inclusion in the sample. To put it mildly, it would be a rather neurotic group leader who did not choose his best group in terms of his effectiveness. While the bias in this sampling procedure is evident to everyone, it represents an unusual situation fortunately not commonly found. Bias in sampling is usually difficult to detect, and its detection requires a person skilled both in sampling procedure and in the specific content area.

Bias will usually occur as a result of any one of the following methods of faulty selection:

1. *Deliberate selection of a representative sample.*—In social work this occurs most often when "typical" cases are selected for study.

2. *A procedure of selection depending on some characteristic which is correlated with the variables under consideration.*—The example of measuring the effectiveness of the group leader fits into this category.

3. *Conscious or unconscious bias in the selection of a random sample.*

4. *Substituting convenient members of the population when difficulties are encountered in obtaining the requisite information.*

—Thus, in sampling case records only those folders which are relatively thin may be selected so as to avoid reading volumes of case material to extract certain information.

5. *Failure to check back on the nonrespondents.*—In a mail questionnaire it cannot be assumed that the nonrespondents are similar to the respondents. It has been found that the less successful members of the profession do not respond as readily as successful members. The same problem may be present when cases are left out of the population for sampling because of the unavailability of the caseworker.

Bias can be avoided if the research worker adheres entirely to a random procedure for selecting the sample, or a random procedure with certain restrictions. When administratively possible, the research investigator may select the sample himself or set up precise instructions so as to leave no leeway of choice for the worker.

While bias should be avoided whenever possible one need not become compulsive about it. If two groups are to be compared and the bias is constant for both groups, it will have little effect. Recently, Paul Horst has shown mathematically that unbiased samples are not always required when working with statistical prediction.

Where the bias which is present is known both in its direction and intensity, there may sometimes be value in purposely selecting a biased sample. This is true where it is desirable to establish the characteristics below which or above which the agency's experience is not likely to go. Were the problem that of determining the maximum extent of specialized services rendered by a generalized agency, a selection of the most complicated problem situations might be taken with full recognition that this is a biased sample of the total case load. This would be true, for example, where seriously delinquent children were selected as a sample of foster care population, or patients with complicated chronic ailments were selected from the case load of a medical social service bureau. While there is an element of prediction involved in any analysis of such a sample as these, in that it purports to show the maximum compli-

cations in service which might conceivably be required, it should be recognized that the real population from which these are drawn is not in reality the total case load of the agency, and therefore generalizations from the analysis of the sample must be made with extreme caution.

The different sampling methods may be classified under five categories: haphazard; random; stratified; systematic; and sequential. By far the simplest and most popular method is nothing more than a haphazard collection of cases. Most often, the most important criterion of this method is availability. If the case is available it is *ipso facto* a member of the sample. For example, in a study of audience reaction to different methods of answering bigoted statements, audiences were collected by asking people in the street if they would like to see a show for some slight financial remuneration. These audiences were then treated as samples of the communities from which they were culled. Haphazard sampling is often the method used in case reading during agency or community surveys. The invalidity of this procedure must be obvious.

Random sampling is the method most suitable for most agencies where the number of sampling units is relatively small, under 1,000. Random sampling implies that each of the sampling units has an equal chance of being selected. A random sample can only be obtained by adherence to some proper random process, such as the use of a table of random numbers. This will work very nicely only when there is a file containing the entire population. If a file does not exist, one can either go through the labor of creating one or use an alternate sampling procedure. Random sampling will not usually work in an uncatalogued population because of the difficulty of developing a method which will permit each case an equal chance of being selected.

In one modification of random sampling procedure, the population is subdivided into groups before selection of the sample. These groups or strata may contain the same or unequal number of sampling units. If a uniform sampling fraction is used, the same proportion of units from each of the strata is selected randomly.

This stratification has two purposes. The first is to increase the over-all accuracy of the population estimates, and the second is to

insure the subdivision of the population into units which are themselves meaningful. In social work research these strata may relate to sex, age, region, economic status, educational level, race, nationality, and nature of the client's problem (diagnosis). As one can readily note, these strata are so devised that the units within each one are very similar to one another. In the case of sex, there is complete homogeneity within the strata. The more homogeneous the strata the greater the accuracy in estimating the population values from the analysis of the sample.

There are other methods of stratification. A population may be stratified for two or more different characteristics. Random samples may then be selected from each strata. For large sample studies a variable sampling fraction can be used which will further increase the accuracy of the population estimates if the strata variances vary greatly.

A method commonly mistaken for random sampling is that of systematic sampling. With this method, if a file or list of cases is available, every n th case is selected. The first case is selected by choosing a random number between 1 and n . This does not make the sampling random. Only if the list itself were randomly arranged would the procedure be called random. Care must be taken, though, to see that there are no periodic characteristics in the list associated with the sampling interval. This systematic sampling technique is in effect a kind of partial stratification and, therefore, if carefully done, the sample will be somewhat more precise than a fully random sample. This method will be recognized as that sometimes labeled "sampling after a random fashion."

The methods just described assume that the sample size is fixed in advance. If the experiment can be conducted on an accumulation-of-information basis, there are methods that require considerably smaller samples than even the best of the fixed-size methods. These procedures, the brilliant work of the late Abraham Wald, are known as sequential analysis because they operate upon the successive terms of the sequence of observations as they are received. These methods have been found to require only about 50 percent as many units in the sample on the average as the best fixed methods for some problems. Except in the field of industrial qual-

ity control this technique has not yet been used very much. The technique was designed to test hypotheses. As each additional case is collected one of the following three decisions is made: accept the hypothesis, reject the hypothesis, or continue the experiment by taking an additional observation. The hypotheses may refer to people as well as to things. The application of the technique in social research will increase as the statistical sophistication of the research workers in this area increases. Its applicability to problems of sampling of intake will be immediately recognized. Being able to determine sequentially whether the cases being added are developing into an adequate sample and having a guide as to when to stop adding cases has great advantages over the present procedure of settling in advance on a sample size, usually many times what is statistically necessary.

Even with modern statistical formulas available it still remains true that the most important consideration in the calculation of the size of a sample is knowledge of the population from which it is to be drawn and of the field in which the study is undertaken. Until recent years, selection of sample size was primarily a matter of rule of thumb. Two mathematical factors were considered significant. One was the statistical law of the stability of large numbers, which led investigators to an assumption that the larger the size of the sample the more likely it would represent the population from which it was drawn. This has been the guiding light of most sampling undertakings of social agency case loads and has been responsible for much of the concern about the supposed inadvisability or impossibility of drawing samples from small case loads. The other algebraic rule, which had a certain disconcerting quality, was that once having decided upon an adequate sample size, increasing the number of units in the sample increased its adequacy only by the square root of the number of times it was multiplied. To go to the effort of doubling the size of a sample to discover that its adequacy as a representative of the total population has been increased by only 1.414 times is somewhat disheartening.

Based upon these two mathematical rules, modern statistics has, however, presented us with a more precise formula for determining the size of a sample, providing that we are willing to decide in

advance what maximum error we can accept in the sample's representing of the total population and providing that we have some rough idea as to the proportion of the total population which has the characteristic we are interested in.

Suppose, for example, that a foster placement agency is concerned with analyzing the characteristics of the children in its foster homes with regard to the experience of replacement from home to home of these children. The agency has some five hundred children placed in foster homes and is desirous of selecting as small a sample as will provide information characteristic of its total population. Suppose, too, that it is important to insure that the sample be representative of the total population with regard to the proportion of children having one placement in a foster home as distinct from those children who have replacement experience. If it is estimated that about 20 percent of the children under care have been placed in foster homes for the first time, and if it is determined that the proportion of these children in the sample shall not differ from the proportion in the total case load by more than a standard error¹ of one percent, we are set to determine the sample size. The formula is:

Sample size equals (NPQ) over $(N$ times the square of the required standard error plus $PQ)$

Where N is the total population, P is the proportion of the population estimated as possessing the required attribute—that is, 20 percent children with single placement— Q is the difference between P and 100 percent, and the required standard error is, we have determined, one percent.

On this basis, it would require a sample size of 380 children to meet these conditions. The highest possible sample size with this standard error would be required if 50 percent of the population had the specified attribute. This means that if 50 percent of the children had one, and only one placement, and we have a one percent standard error requirement, the sample would have to be 417 cases. However, it can quickly be recognized that a stipulation of a one percent standard error is a little fancy for an undertaking in

¹ Standard error is a measure of the magnitude of sampling fluctuation.

which the measures of the attributes themselves, those characteristics of the children and the experiences of replacement, will produce calculations with much greater variability. If the standard error acceptable were 3 percent, only 130 cases would be required as a maximum; if we could be happy with a standard error of as much as 5 percent, we would need no more than 60 cases.

The single case frequently makes its appearance in the social work literature. Whether a single case can be considered a statistical sample or not depends upon the nature of the research. If we are dealing with nonvariable behavior so that the factor of individual differences can be ignored, and providing that the results from the single case fit in with other established facts or hypotheses it may not be necessary to use more than the single case. There is no sampling problem here, but it becomes the responsibility of the investigator to show either that variation does not exist or that such changes as are produced or observed are greater than any possible individual differences. There are those who believe that complete knowledge on one individual is better than incomplete knowledge on many. This is undoubtedly true for the single individual, but it raises a problem concerning generalizations to others. Knowing about a single case may be important, but its greater significance is for illustration or clarification of data derived from more adequate sampling, or for the pilot exploration and development of hypothesis for scientific testing.

To summarize, it is our contention that practically every question which comes up in the consideration of small case loads, and in which the purpose of the study and the delineation of the question to be answered can be made clear and specific, lends itself to the application of sampling technique. One further qualification, of course, is whether the economy of time and energy is needed or whether the detail possible by limiting the examination to a sampling will add to the total undertaking. There is no value in complicating life with sampling procedure where simple tabulations on a total case load will answer questions without the necessity of a study design.

If sampling is to be used, the method should be random sampling or a stratified or systematic procedure in which a random

process is used. It is actually no more expensive or time-consuming to adhere to good sampling procedures than to depend upon a haphazard arrangement.

While knowledge of the field and of the data are of prime importance, modern sampling theory has provided us with security in utilizing samples of small case loads with assurance as to their reliability and validity. We must, however, be willing to define in advance the limits of statistical difference between the sample and the population from which it is drawn, and we must make every assurance against the introduction of bias in our method of sample selection.

With these points in mind, sensible, reliable sampling can become part of the tools of any administrator or supervisor or research technician.

Modern Methods of Measuring Public Reaction and the Applications of These Methods to the Social Welfare Field

By RENSIS LIKERT and RONALD LIPPITT

ONE OF THE MAJOR PROBLEMS that the social welfare field faces is that of securing adequate funds to carry out its work. It might therefore be useful in discussing methods for measuring public opinions and reactions to indicate how this research methodology can be applied to the specific problem of conducting successful community chest drives.

Some of the questions to which answers are needed are the following: What kinds of people contribute to the community chest? What kinds of people make large contributions relative to their income and which make small contributions relative to their resources? Why do some of these people contribute generously and why do others contribute relatively meager amounts? Why do some people not contribute at all? How should the community chest drive be conducted so as to achieve understanding and generous support?

The problem of how to conduct a successful community chest drive is very similar to a problem on which we have done a substantial amount of research. Consequently, we shall use that to illustrate what can be done through research to help improve community chest drives as well as to improve community understanding and support for the social welfare agencies.

During the past nine years we have used the sample survey in a series of studies for the United States Treasury Department to discover why people do or do not buy bonds and why they redeem

bonds or hold them. Initially, we conducted these studies as the Division of Program Surveys of the United States Department of Agriculture; more recently we have conducted them as the Survey Research Center. These studies have been done under the general direction of Dr. Dorwin Cartwright and Dr. George Katona.

In 1943, immediately after the second war bond drive, we interviewed a national sample of about eighteen hundred persons to find why people did or did not buy bonds during the drive and what should be done to increase the effectiveness of the third bond drive. When respondents were asked why they bought war bonds most of them gave a patriotic reason, as, for example, that the government needed the money to buy war equipment. Other answers often were that bonds were a good investment or that the money was being set aside for education, retirement, or postwar purchases. Only a small proportion answered that they bought bonds because they were asked to buy or because of social pressure.

In designing the study of the second war bond drive, however, we felt that personal solicitation might be an important variable affecting bond buying. Consequently, at one point in the interview we specifically asked each respondent whether during the drive he had been asked personally to buy war bonds. At another point we asked the respondent whether he had bought more bonds than usual during the drive and how much more.

We found that of all gainfully employed people, 25 percent reported that they had been asked personally to buy war bonds. When we grouped these people together we found that 47 percent of this group bought more bonds during the second war bond drive than they had been buying. Among the three-fourths of gainfully employed persons who had not been asked to buy, however, only 12 percent had bought more bonds than usual.

We found that this relationship between bond buying and solicitation held for every income group, for every occupational group, and for every geographical region. No matter how we grouped our data, we found that among those who were asked to buy there were about 35 percentage points more buyers than among those who were not asked to buy. Of all the different factors influencing bond-

buying behavior, personal solicitation appeared to be one of the most important so far as our data were concerned.

The results from the study of the second war bond drive on the effectiveness of solicitation were called to the attention of T. R. Gamble, Director of the War Finance Division, with the strong recommendation that a major effort be made to increase the amount of personal solicitation in the third bond drive. The War Finance Division made this an important objective. They presented our results in regional meetings and published a report making these findings available to state, county, and local war bond committees.

In our survey following the third war bond drive, we found that personal solicitation had been doubled: 50 percent of all gainfully employed persons were solicited. We had expected that the net effectiveness of solicitation would decrease somewhat as a larger proportion of the population was solicited. Actually, that did not occur; 59 percent of those who were personally solicited bought more bonds than usual. Among those who were not personally asked to buy, only 18 percent bought additional bonds.

The real test of the effectiveness of solicitation, however, was the relation that was found between the amount of solicitation and the amount of bonds sold. The doubling of personal solicitation resulted in almost doubling the amount of Series E bonds that were sold. In the second drive \$1,500,000,000 of Series E bonds were sold; \$2,500,000,000 were sold in the third. Throughout all the drives, there was a close relationship between the amount of solicitation and the total amount of bonds sold to individuals.

Other indications that the relation between solicitation and buying was not spurious were also found. When the organization and activities of counties and smaller geographical units were examined, a marked relationship was found between the amount of personal solicitation and the success of the unit in selling bonds.

The Treasury Department had feared that soliciting people more than once in a particular drive would result in decreased buying because of resentment upon the part of those who were asked more than once to buy. Before we started making studies for them, they had changed the structure of the bond-selling organ-

ization in order to minimize the likelihood of multiple solicitation. Actually, our findings showed that when people were asked once to buy, about 60 percent bought; when asked twice, about 70 percent bought; when asked three or more times, about 80 percent bought. Moreover, we found no evidence of resentment over being asked more than once to buy.

As might be expected from social psychological theory, solicitation was more effective at the place of work than at home. Of those who were asked at work to buy, about 65 percent bought additional bonds. Of those who were asked at home, only 55 percent bought. These figures varied slightly from drive to drive, but the relation was always the same.

We also found that men were more effective solicitors than women. More of the persons asked by men bought additional bonds than of those asked by women, the difference being about 15 percentage points.

In asking people to buy, solicitors could give various reasons as to why the person should buy: the government needs the money; bonds are a good investment; it is better to save now and buy after the war when commodities are available again; etc. However, of all the reasons used to encourage people to buy bonds, the reason which was most effective was the one which involved a reference to a local or group quota, as for example, "Bill, the quota in our shop is so much. How about it?"

Note the pattern of these results. Solicitation on the job is more effective than at home. Reference to a local quota or a quota for the group improved the results. The data indicate that the more important the social group is to the individual, the greater is the effectiveness of solicitation by members of this group. The work group for most people is more important than the neighborhood group. Moreover, our work colleagues know more about our capacity to contribute than do our neighbors and consequently expect from each person as much as he can appropriately do on each project that has real group support. It is significant that this general pattern of the power of the group influence is borne out by other experimental research.

These results on the effectiveness of personal solicitation, as well

as evidence from other studies that we have done, make us feel that personal solicitation is an important factor affecting the success of community chest drives. But our data suggest that the effectiveness of personal solicitation will depend upon how much the group involved is committed to the goal for which the solicitation is being conducted. It is necessary, therefore, to have widespread support for the goals and objectives of the organizations represented in the community chest if solicitation is to be effective.

Here again the sample survey can obtain valuable measurements. It can show what kinds of persons are correctly informed about the community chest and the organizations involved and who is uninformed; how different groups feel about the chest and why; and what kinds of publicity and information are most likely to bring understanding and support.

For example, the studies for the Treasury Department obtained data on the relative effectiveness of different appeals in encouraging people to buy bonds. Almost everyone was aware of, and seemed to be influenced by, patriotic reasons for buying bonds. Of all the other appeals, the one which appeared to be most effective was the anti-inflation one. Those who realized that buying war bonds was a way of helping to prevent inflation bought the most bonds per dollar of income. Another finding was that the more different reasons people saw for buying bonds, the more bonds they bought. We also obtained data on how to use the mass media to open the door for solicitors and to encourage people to volunteer to serve as solicitors for the bond campaigns.

How do we conduct sample surveys to obtain measurements like these and how accurate are the results from such studies? Let us answer the last question first. Our results on the purchase, ownership, and redemption of Series E bonds checked closely with Treasury data. For example, during the last half of November, 1945, we interviewed a national sample of 2,300 persons who received income. We asked these respondents whether they owned any Series E bonds and, if so, how much. The reported total amounted on the average to \$590. At that time there were an estimated 51,000,000 income receivers. Fifty-one million times \$590 yields an estimate of \$30,090,000,000 of Series E bonds outstanding. The Treasury re-

port on December 1 showed the actual figure to be \$30,263,000,000.

Substantial additional evidence on the accuracy of surveys could be submitted, but let us turn now to how a survey is conducted and some of the errors to be avoided. The selection of the sample is one of the first steps. The accuracy of any sample depends, not only upon its size, but also upon how it is selected. It is essential for accuracy that the sample be drawn in a manner that will prevent occurrence of any bias. This means that the sample must be drawn in such a way that each person in the group being sampled has an equal or known chance of being selected.

The only way to give each person his proper chance of falling into the sample is to use some random procedure. If a list of names is available, every n th name can be picked, starting with some number picked at random less than $n + 1$. In case the persons are widely scattered geographically, the amount of travel required to obtain interviews with every n th person may be prohibitively costly. In this case, the sample can be designed to yield the proper number of persons by first selecting at random a limited number of geographical areas and then selecting from a list at random the kinds of persons being studied who are located in these areas. The greatest amount of accurate data per interview is obtained when every n th person is interviewed, irrespective of his geographical location. However, the cost per interview of such interviews is also at a maximum. Methods are available for computing the sample design which will yield the greatest amount of information per dollar expended by assigning the most economical balance between the number of areas used and the number of interviews in each geographical area.

Just as sampling experts design the sample, so the questionnaire is built by the study director assisted by a few expert interviewers. If the results of previous surveys on this problem are not available to these persons, they usually conduct a pilot study, or do some exploratory interviews before attempting to design the questionnaire.

There are several reasons why this preliminary information is essential. Until it is available, the study director is never sure that he knows all the different points of view, experience, and motiva-

tional factors that exist in the group being studied. A study to be well-designed must include measures of any important variable that is functioning in the given situation. Preliminary information from previous work or exploratory interviews is needed to frame the questions in the vocabulary and colloquialisms of the group being studied. Stiffly worded questions, or questions framed in language rarely used, do not elicit cooperation and full, frank answers from respondents.

A common and often serious source of error in questionnaire construction is to assume that, to obtain the data desired, one need merely ask the questions which in essence are the statements of objectives of the study. An illustration may make clear the nature and seriousness of this error. In the research for the Treasury Department, a major objective was to discover why people bought bonds. When people were asked the direct question as to why they bought bonds, most of them gave a patriotic reason, as for example, that the government needed the money to buy war equipment. As we have seen, other answers often mentioned the investment value of bonds, or that money was being set aside for special purposes, while only a small proportion bought bonds because they were solicited, or because they were subjected to social pressure.

If reliance had been placed merely on asking people the direct question as to why they bought bonds, the importance of solicitation would never have been discovered. It was sound research design that gave valid answers. Numerous other illustrations of the inadequacy of the direct approach could be cited.

It cost some automobile manufacturers money and grief to discover that people did not mean what they said when the companies asked whether they wanted more or less chromium decorations on their new cars. The people answered that they wanted less, but they bought the cars that carried more chromium.

Rather than using the direct answers to direct questions, sound research design calls for an approach which measures the magnitude and character of relevant variables. Usually the following steps are involved: First, intelligent hypotheses are developed stating what forces or variables may have a causal influence on the behavior being studied. Second, questions are designed which will

obtain data from each respondent on the relative presence or absence of each of these influences, so far as he is concerned. Third, these questions are then built into an interview form in which the order of questions and their working interest respondents and progressively build rapport. Fourth, data from each respondent are then obtained, using a carefully designed sample and well-trained interviewers. Fifth, the full narrative answers of respondents are converted to qualitative and quantitative categories by a process of coding and check-coding. Sixth, the relative importance of each factor or influence is tested by examining the relationship between the presence and absence of the influence and the behavior or attitudes being studied.

The questionnaire must include questions adequate to elicit the information necessary to categorize each respondent on each variable to be used in the analysis. To find whether the questionnaire adequately meets this requirement, it is necessary to run trial interviews with respondents like those to be included in the final sample. This trial is called the "pretest," and it invariably results in substantial changes in the questionnaire. Some questions prove to be ambiguous or not clear. Others may be worded in ways that irritate respondents. Often the order of the questions must be changed so that the interview will flow in an easy, conversational manner.

Often on the pretest, further hypotheses will be developed from the information obtained from the pretest interviews. These hypotheses must then be included in the research design and questions added to cover them.

After going through several revisions during the pretest, an interview form will be devised which seems to work satisfactorily from every standpoint. Twenty-five to fifty interviews are then taken with this last revision. At this point, the study director makes a final test of the questionnaire by attempting to code the responses of the preliminary interviews. Coding is the process of assigning quantitative or qualitative categories to the answers obtained during the interview. If the questionnaire is functioning satisfactorily, it will elicit answers which are readily coded and which, when coded, yield measurements that meet the basic objectives of the study.

After the sample design is completed and a final form of the questionnaire emerges from the pretest, the interviewers start work. They obtain interviews with each respondent specified by the sample design. Since the sample designates particular persons, the interviewers have no latitude in selecting who is to be interviewed.

The interviewers are not only provided with the questionnaire and sampling instructions, they are also given a detailed statement of the objectives of each question. By knowing the kind of information each question seeks to obtain, they can tell when the question is functioning satisfactorily and when it is securing irrelevant material. This knowledge does not bias the interview. For example, knowing that a particular question aims at securing information on the degree of fatigue experienced in doing certain tasks does not predispose the interviewer to expect answers indicating a high or low degree of fatigue.

As the interviews are conducted, the study director and coding staff prepare and test the codes used to categorize the answers obtained in the interviews. After the codes are prepared they are tested by having two or more persons independently code the same interviews. On any questions where different results are obtained, the cause for the difference is examined and the code reconstructed until it works satisfactorily. The code is then used to categorize all responses obtained in the interviews. From 10 to 25 percent of the interviews selected at random are independently check-coded to test the reliability of the coding of each item.

After the coding is completed, the tabulations and cross-tabulations required to test the original hypotheses are run. Additional tabulations are also made to test new hypotheses that develop during the analysis of the data.

Since all measurements are subject to sampling errors, results must be tested by statistical analysis to be certain that the relationships observed are not due to chance. This is done by computing whether the relationships are sufficiently large and clear-cut that they cannot have been produced by errors of measurement.

These steps briefly describe the procedure involved in using the sample interview survey. As will be observed, the process is fundamentally different from polling, in several important respects. The

sampling procedure, for example, is completely objective and random and not subject to biases as is the quota sampling method used by opinion polls. Moreover, it differs from the polls in using the free-answer interviewing technique and in employing an experimental research design in testing the basic hypotheses of the study.

As its name implies, the sample interview survey involves obtaining data from a sample of respondents by means of a systematic interview. It is important to emphasize that surveys obtain appreciably more data than the opinions people hold. In addition to attitudes and opinions, information is usually obtained on the personal characteristics of respondents, such as their age or education; their knowledge and misinformation on items related to the problem being studied; their experience and behavior on matters related to the study; and, finally, the motives underlying their attitudes and behavior. This research tool can be used to study a wide variety of problems in the social welfare field involving human reactions and behavior.

We have seen how the sample survey can be used to build support for community chest drives. A few illustrations of the many other kinds of problems for which it can be used are:

1. Agency program evaluation:

a) How effectively is the agency working, in the judgment of the public generally? What support does it have?

b) What segments of the population feel that the agency is working well? What segments feel that it is working poorly? Why?

c) What suggestions or criticisms do people have? What improvements do they seek? Why?

d) How well informed are people about the agency's program and its objectives? What groups are uninformed or misinformed? How can they most readily be informed?

e) If the program involves participation on the part of people, what kinds of people are participating? What segments of the public are refusing to participate? Why?

f) How well is the agency accomplishing its objectives? What staff activities are contributing to its achieving its objectives? Which activities are ineffective and wasteful?

2. Agency organization:

- a) Is the present organizational structure best suited to the agency's objectives?
- b) What management practices contribute to the success of the agency?
- c) What management practices are impeding the effective operation of the agency?
- d) What further training of staff would help the agency best to achieve its objective?
- e) What methods of training will best accomplish these goals?

With regard to agency organization and operation, it is interesting to note that the Institute for Social Research is using the sample survey in an extensive program of research aimed at discovering the major principles affecting organizational effectiveness. Many of the results of this research are probably applicable to the organization and operation of social welfare agencies.

The sample survey can be very useful to social welfare agencies by providing accurate facts needed to make policy decisions and to take efficient administrative action. M. L. Wilson, Director of the United States Extension Service, is now urging the state Extension Services to put as much as 5 percent of their budget into studies to evaluate and guide their educational efforts. We are reasonably confident that many social welfare agencies would achieve appreciably greater results per dollar spent if they too spent approximately 5 percent of their budget for research to guide and evaluate their program activities and to provide a sound basis for the planning and decision-making that must go into the necessary continuous process of improvement of county effort and agency practice.

We hope that the collaborative use of scientifically sound sample survey techniques will be one of the many ways in which increased teamwork of professional social workers and social scientists will develop. Such collaboration is certain to provide new insights toward our common goal of more efficient and more democratic social welfare procedures.

Further Needs in the Social Insurances

By *EVELINE M. BURNS*

IN 1950, AFTER UNUSUALLY LONG AND CAREFUL STUDY, the Congress again radically amended the Social Security Act. The first amendment took place in 1939, when, among other changes, what had been a retirement program was enlarged to become an old age and survivors system. It is fitting that we should take stock and ask what yet needs to be done if the institution of social insurance is to be utilized to the full extent of its potentialities for increasing the well-being of American individuals and families.

It is helpful to note that, like so many other countries, we have come to use the social insurance principle on a piecemeal basis. Specifically, we have classified the causes of loss or interruption of income by reference to certain risks and have developed separate systems to deal with each risk. Of the major risks now identified, namely, old age, survivorship, unemployment, and disability, the Social Security Amendments Act of 1950 affects in major degree only old age and survivorship. But here the changes have been of the greatest significance.

The new act represents a major shift away from the principles of private, commercial insurance toward those of social insurance. It was perhaps inevitable, when these far-reaching measures were first introduced, that the analogy to private insurance should have been stressed. Perhaps only thus could so radical a suggestion as that benefits should be payable to people as a right, and of an amount and under nondeterrent conditions which were clearly set out in the law, have been rendered acceptable to a people accustomed to think that poverty was, if not a crime, at least evidence of a grave weakness of character. The original act, in its eligibility and benefit conditions, endeavored to keep a fairly close relationship between

what an individual paid in and what he got out of the system. The consequences could easily have been anticipated. If you insist that only a fairly long period of coverage entitles an individual to qualify for benefits, then by definition the system will not make much of a dent on the social problem of the old age needs of those who are already elderly at the time the act is passed. If you insist that benefits must fairly strictly reflect an individual's previous earnings, then the low-paid worker who is most likely to be in need and whose private savings are likely to be least, will receive benefits that are likely to be too low to avoid the necessity for public assistance supplementation. If you say that a man's benefit must also reflect the number of years he has been covered by the system, then again the man who is already old when the law is enacted will have a low benefit because he has not had the opportunity to accumulate increments for many years of coverage by the time he is sixty-five.

The necessity to modify the pure private insurance principle was of course recognized almost from the first: the benefit formula was weighted in favor of the lower paid employee, and in 1939 dependents' benefits were added. What the 1950 amendments do is to carry much further this step away from private insurance. The liberalization of the eligibility conditions, the change in the benefit formula, the elimination of the one percent increment for years of coverage, and the bold decision to raise the money value of the benefits of all existing beneficiaries imply an acceptance of the view that only by an emphasis upon the social component of social insurance can this institution serve as an effective answer to the widespread social problem of economic insecurity due to old age or death of a breadwinner.

By extending coverage to some nine to ten million persons in occupations or employments hitherto excluded, the Congress not only made old age and survivors insurance (OASI) available to many who had hitherto been denied its benefits, but also indirectly raised the benefits of many others whose average monthly wage, and hence whose monthly benefit, had been lowered by virtue of the fact of working for some part of their lives in uncovered employment. Some measure of lower covered earnings will of course persist until there is universal coverage, for even after the amend-

ment there are some fourteen million persons outside the scope of the Act. Furthermore, until periods of genuine unemployment or absence from work because of sickness are disregarded in calculating the average monthly wage, the revised benefit formula will penalize the worker who has been sick or unemployed for any period.

It must be admitted, too, that the extensions of 1950 have been achieved at the cost of enormous complexity. Congress appears to have been so anxious to respond to the views of every voluble group that people are excluded because of their profession, or the individual employer they work for, or the length of time they have worked for him, or the way in which their employment is distributed over the week when working for different employers, or whether or not they were covered by an existing public retirement system, however inadequate. The provisions relating to agricultural workers are perhaps the most objectionable, resulting, as they will, in excluding not only all migrant workers but also large numbers of steady nonmigrant workers whose only fault is that they changed employers or changed jobs at the wrong time. Those relating to domestic workers make little more sense. Here efforts should be directed to eliminating the concept of employment with a given employer as the test of regularity of employment, if indeed it is still necessary for administrative reasons to limit coverage to those who are "regular" workers. The complexity of the coverage provisions can be illustrated by considering social workers, who will be divided into those who are uncovered if they work for a nonprofit organization which does not wish to be covered; covered, if they work for one that does so wish and for which two thirds of their fellow employees also desires coverage; uncovered, if this majority vote is not obtained, or if they were of the minority that voted against coverage; covered, if they join an agency that has already secured coverage for its employees; uncovered, if working for a public agency that does not wish to be covered or if working for one that wishes to be covered but has an existing retirement plan; covered, if working for one that desires coverage and has no such plan; and, finally, covered, if engaged in private practice.

There is thus considerable unfinished business relating to OASI

coverage. In addition, it is a matter for regret that the amending act take a step backward in the new financial arrangements. Most social workers had welcomed the step taken in 1943, when in recognition of the consequences of failure to carry through the statutory increases in wage and pay-roll taxes, provision was made for an eventual contribution from the general taxpayer. Unfortunately, the amending act reverts to the principle embodied in the original act whereby the whole costs of the program will be met out of taxes levied on workers and their employers, a method of financing which is at best nonprogressive, and, to the extent that employers are able to shift their contributions via higher prices, positively regressive. At the same time, I should add my suspicion that this situation will probably remedy itself. Unless the purposes of the reserve are more widely understood than they now are, I suspect that as Congress sees the reserve mount toward its new high total of over eighty billions there will be a familiar unwillingness to make the scheduled tax increases so that once again a government contribution will come in by the back door.

Nevertheless, it would be a carping critic and one with a lack of historical perspective who would not feel that the 1950 amendments advance us a long way toward solution through social insurance of the problem of insecurity for the aged and for survivors. Unfortunately, the same cannot be said for the two other major risks to family security. The unemployment insurance programs, which continue to operate under state control and seem likely to do so in the foreseeable future, barring a serious depression, do not exhibit the same clear trend toward a truly social insurance approach. The favorable financial experience of the years since 1941 (which was only slightly interrupted in 1946-47) has not been utilized to make the system a more efficient instrument for meeting family income loss due to unemployment, but rather to reduce the taxes paid by employers. It is true that in all states there has been some effort to bring the laws more into conformity with their objective, namely, the obvious purpose of meeting income loss due to unemployment. Yet the average proportion of income loss met by the average benefit is still below 50 percent, and in many states the minimum weekly benefit is miserably low. Although the duration

of the period of benefit payment has also increased, the majority of the states still have a maximum less than twenty-six weeks, and only a small proportion provide for a uniform benefit duration for all workers. Despite the fact that the average worker has some family responsibilities, less than a quarter of the laws provide benefits for dependents. Coverage is still denied to employees of small firms in most of the states, despite the experience under OASI and in some of the states which shows that there is no longer any administrative obstacle to such coverage. Nor are agricultural or domestic workers covered, though it must be admitted that there are real problems in coverage of the latter. In addition, there are some definitely backward steps. Over the country as a whole there has been a tendency to tighten disqualifications and in some instances to introduce more severe eligibility conditions.

I believe that this failure to make unemployment insurance a more efficient instrument for meeting human needs is directly attributable to the method of financing this program. All but two of the states now support the system exclusively from taxes on employers. In all the states, experience-rating provisions have been adopted whereby employers are enabled to secure tax rebates or reductions. Quite apart from the fact that the formulas adopted are in general poorly devised to attain their alleged objective, namely, to encourage employment-stabilizing activities, and have other serious economic consequences which I cannot enlarge upon here, a system of financing that gives the employer alone a direct financial interest in the benefit eligibility and disqualification provisions inevitably loads the scales against due consideration being given in the legislative halls to the social purpose of the program. Not until workers are willing also to contribute to the costs of the unemployment insurance, thereby *inter alia* removing the employers' quite logical defense of experience rating in a system which by throwing all costs on employers implies that employers are responsible for unemployment—not until this happens are the chances very bright for a more balanced legislative consideration of the vital provisions affecting eligibility, disqualifications, and amount of benefit. I believe, too, that the addition of a contribution from the general taxpayer would, among other advantages, serve to em-

phasize the fact that the public as a whole has a vital interest in the nature of our unemployment insurance laws and the extent to which they are utilized to meet the social problem of income loss due to unemployment.

With all these limitations we have nonetheless made more effective use of the social insurance principle in dealing with the unemployment risk than we have in the field of disability. Here only one group of workers, the railroad employees, are protected by social insurance against the risks both of permanent and of temporary disability. All other workers are at best protected in varying degree against occupationally caused income losses through workmen's compensation laws, and in four states the majority of workers are protected against income loss due to general disability, however caused, but only for short periods of wage loss. Undoubtedly, the most regrettable feature of the Amending Act of 1950 was the failure to enact permanent disability insurance which could well have been administratively integrated with OASI. Failure to cover this risk through social insurance is the most outstanding weakness of the present system. It is the more surprising in view of the fact that this type of measure has long been successfully operated in other countries, while even in the United States the workmen's compensation programs and the railroad employees system have shown that the administrative problems are not beyond the capacity of government. The new permanent and total disability assistance program is a miserable substitute, and its creation is in direct opposition to the specific preference expressed by both Senate and House for social insurance as a way of "providing more effective income protection free from the humiliation of a test of need."

Short-period or temporary disability insurance seems likely to develop, if at all, on the state level. The four existing state laws, like the corresponding unemployment insurance laws, are characterized by occupational and size-of-firm exclusions and fail to provide for dependents' benefits. Their contribution to the solution of the problem of income loss due to disability is at best limited. More serious, however, is the fact that a new issue has been raised by the method of financing these measures in all states except

Rhode Island. Essentially, the issue is whether temporary disability financing shall follow the principles embodied in workmen's compensation laws where benefit payment obligations are laid on employers who are required to insure themselves against this liability, as against the principles embodied in the more modern social insurance laws such as OASI or unemployment insurance where the obligation to assure the benefits offered in the law is laid on the state which levies taxes to finance the program. A further issue is whether, if the workmen's compensation principle is adopted, commercial insurance companies shall be permitted to compete for the business.

It is difficult not to believe that reversion to the workmen's compensation principle, which began in California with permission to employers to contract out of the state system, and reached its culmination in the New York law which frankly adopts workmen's compensation methods of financing, is a backward step. Quite apart from the undesirability in a public program of requiring the worker to make his claim to his own or his employer's insurance company instead of to a neutral public agency, the amount available for benefits from any given dollar collected is inevitably less when the competitive costs of getting business must be covered as is the case when insurance is written with private companies instead of allowing the state to collect the funds through the normal tax collection machinery. In addition, allowing employers to contract out of the plan or to insure with private firms rather than with the state exposes the state fund to the danger of being left with the worst risks. Although California has endeavored to prevent this by legal provisions, experience seems to show that in practice it is almost impossible thus to protect the state fund. Most serious of all is the lack of public accountability that results when part or all of the financing is done by private insurance. It is a sobering thought that even today we do not know how many workers receive benefits under workmen's compensation or exactly what benefits they receive. Nor do we know what it actually costs to provide any specific level of benefits on a state-wide basis.

I have hitherto concentrated upon social insurance developments in the field of income maintenance where we have still a large

measure of unfinished business. I have said nothing about other applications of social insurance which are common in other countries, and notably the use of this principle, or some modification of it, to meet the costs of rearing children and of medical care. Both are important causes of poverty and both are amenable to public action. Whether or not America could immediately adopt some form of children's allowances is a debatable point. But the fact remains that in America as elsewhere the level of living of the family is directly affected by the number of persons who have to share one income, and it is difficult to see why social workers, of all people, are not closely studying this exciting new development to see what its consequences are and whether with appropriate modifications it might not be adopted here. So far as health insurance for medical care is concerned, the issue seems to me to be not whether the principle of social insurance can be applied to this threat to family well-being, for that question has been answered affirmatively by a large number of countries. It is rather whether, if public action in regard to medical care is to be contemplated, a public medical service would not be preferable to public health insurance.

It is obvious that all extensions of social insurance or public action will meet opposition—from those who dislike higher taxation or extensions of governmental activity as such to those, who have a direct professional or financial interest in the outcome. Much of the strength of the opposition builds upon prevailing ignorance of precisely how these measures would work, how far difficulties encountered in any given case are inherent in the method, and how far they are due to poorly devised provisions which are not inherent in the system and could therefore be changed, or how far they are due to environmental conditions which might or might not obtain here. The ignorance extends too to such matters as the consequences of the absence of public action and the nature of human beings, what they want and to what incentives they respond. The tragedy is that all the assertions made by those who are opposed to public action are not being countered by facts based upon careful study of the evidence. Who should be producing this evidence, if not the social workers of America? It is they who should be in the vanguard, constantly appraising the effectiveness of each social pro-

gram brought into being for the alleged purpose of helping individuals and families. It is they who should be the informed experts to whom the public could turn for reliable information as to the potentialities and costs, both financial and social, of every new social invention. Until as a profession we are willing to accept this responsibility we have no right to complain that there are so many unmet needs in our present social security legislation.

The Caseworker's Use of Collateral Information

By HELEN HARRIS PERLMAN

ON THE FACE OF IT, no aspect of social casework practice looks as neatly packaged as the use of collateral information. Some eighty years ago the first social service exchange was established as a systematic means of exchanging information about clients among social agencies, and over these many years agencies have registered the fact of their knowledge of a case and have shared information about their clients. For most of these years it was accepted without question that this was a valid and valuable procedure. Then, largely within the past ten years, pushed by our heightened awareness of the client as a personality, by our deepened convictions about maintaining democratic principles, by our growing competence in purposive interviewing, there have risen a number of provocative questions to challenge these practices. These questions have centered on the ethics of exchanging information allegedly given in confidence and on the actual usefulness of such data. Today, approaching the topic of the use of collateral information is like prying open the lid of Pandora's box—a swarm of plaguing questions rises up to buzz about one's head, and they are not readily dealt with.

There have been a number of admirable efforts on the part of social workers to deal with these issues.¹ I shall do no more than take some part in that ongoing professional discussion. I have closed the lid of the box sharply against a number of considerations, and have narrowed my topic to the use of social agency information and

¹ Among the notable contributions are: Charlotte Towle, "The Client's Rights and the Use of the Social Service Exchange," *Social Service Review*, XXIII (March, 1949), 15-20; Beatrice R. Simcox, *The Social Service Exchange* (New York: Family Service Association of America, 1946); *Principles of Confidentiality in Social Work* (Washington, D.C.: Committee on Records, District of Columbia Chapter, American Association of Social Workers, 1947).

to the question of its usefulness, not to the agency nor to the community, but to the client himself.

To clear or not to clear, to register or not to register, to give, to take—even a casual scanning of discussions will reveal that all these considerations are loaded with the social caseworker's feelings. Because we know the powerful effect of emotions on our reasoning processes it behooves us to look unblinkingly at our subjective involvements first.

At the very heart of our professional thinking about the use of information about clients lurk some old feelings that have the dust of the last century upon them. They are feelings of guilt because the social service exchange and communications between agencies were originally conceived of as a check against the client, a means of preventing him from exploiting community resources. We feel apologetic, somehow, that a virtue was made of a necessity and we look askance at the motives of our forebears. Of course, one of the things which people rarely recognize about their ancestors, whether they admire or deplore them, is that they were the product of their time and place, and what they were or did was dictated in large part by historical necessity. The kinds of social services that existed in 1870, the kinds of social workers who manned them, the people who came to them—all these determined the nature of the social service exchanges of that day and of the years that followed.

Rising out of these old feelings, perhaps in part to protect us against our guilt, are some bright new ones. These are feelings of identification with, and championship of, the client. When they are expressed in the extreme they say that the client is always right and that he alone knows what he wants or needs. Implied in this is that he alone must have the authority to say what shall be done and how it shall be done in his behalf. These feelings too have their roots in the time and place of our profession. The recognition of the dignity and integrity of human beings, the affirmation and reaffirmation of the rights of the individual, the vigilance lest authoritarian forces of any sort undermine our liberties—these are the democratic necessities today, and social work is a bulwark to them. If it is to be such a bulwark it must operate realistically with the recognition of limits upon individual rights which are neces-

sary both to the welfare of a person himself as well as to his society. Of this, more will be said later. What is to be noted here is that the feeling that the client was often wrong has produced a polar reaction to the effect that he is always right, always competent to make his own and sometimes to make the social worker's decisions.

I suspect that, as usual, truth can be found somewhere between these polar feelings. The client is not bad, untruthful, or incompetent just because he is a client; neither is he good, honest, and competent just because he is a client. The client of a social agency is a human being. Human beings are both good and bad, competent and incompetent, truthful and untruthful, responsible and irresponsible. No particular vice is the inevitable accompaniment of being in need of an agency's services, nor is there any reason to assume that a halo falls upon the head of him who enters a social agency's door. Social casework would be a shallow practice indeed if it denied the people who came to use it the right, if you will, to have some of the human frailties of character or mind or temporary aberrations of behavior and judgment. We affirm the dignity of the human being with all his faultiness.

Our feelings about the client as a person and our sometime need to see him as all wrong or all right have borne heavily, it seems to me, upon our thinking about seeking and using information from other sources about him. They require our reckoning with them.

Our way is not clear yet, because now we must come to grips with several philosophical concepts which mold our thinking on this subject. One of these is the concept of the confidentiality of the professional relationship with a client; the other is the concept of the client's right to self-determination. I should like to suggest some aspects of these concepts which have been insufficiently taken into account.

First is the promise, implicit or explicit, which we make to our clients of confidentiality. What exactly does the social caseworker promise when she promises confidentiality? Does she actually promise that what the client tells her will be known to no one but herself? If she does, it is unethical because it is not true. What the client tells her will be known to the typist who transcribes the record, to the supervisor who reads it, to the workers who follow after

her, perhaps to the psychiatrist or the home economist or the regional director who may be consulted. All the caseworker can truthfully promise is that what the client tells her will be used responsibly, and will be guarded against misuse. That is, the ethics of the profession of social work holds its practitioners and those who are adjuncts to its practice (such as clerical staff) to using the objective or subjective data which the client reveals in the client's behalf. Only when his pursuit of his interests are judged to be "wrong," that is, in violation of law or accepted standards, may the information he has given be used in the welfare of others than himself. This is the only valid guarantee of confidentiality which the social caseworker can give her client.

I dare say it is all the client wants. There is actually very little that passes from client to caseworker which is of the nature of the guilty "secret." I suppose that the only reason that any one of us wants secrecy at all, in any relationship, is the fear that the revelation of the information will hurt us in some way. Therefore, all that is sought in a confidential professional relationship is that what is told should be used responsibly and in the confider's interests.

Some of the confusion in our thinking has arisen, perhaps, because of our search to fortify ourselves by analogous situations in other professions. We have compared our practices with those of doctors and lawyers and priests and have emerged more than ever troubled by what has seemed to be their more carefully locked professional confidentiality. But these comparisons have failed to note one tremendous factor of difference between these professions and the profession of social work: the social worker is not a private practitioner; she is a paid representative of an agency which is one of a number of agencies supported by the community. When an individual is sick he chooses his doctor and places his confidence in his hands; when he needs legal help he does likewise with a lawyer; when he seeks confession he chooses his priest. The person who seeks a social service comes, not to a person of his choice but to an agency of his choice. He chooses this agency rather than another not because he thinks this one is more reliable or trustworthy but because its function meets his problem as he sees it. He gives his confidence to the agency, of which this person, called his case-

worker, is a representative. The caseworker bears the professional responsibility to encourage his revealing only what is relevant to the agency's work with him. What is revealed is put, not in the worker's private files, but in the agency's record.

In thinking of the confidential relationship, then, we must recognize that there is a difference between the deposit of confidence in an individual who is assumed to embody all the service asked for and the deposit of confidence in an individual who acts as one part of that whole which is the social agency. If the social welfare agency embodies a number of functions there is the probability that in the interests of a given client the information given to one worker may have to be shared with several others. If the social agency has a specialized function and other special functions are carried by other agencies in the community, there is the possibility that in the interests of a given client the information given one agency may have to be shared with another. In the final analysis, it is the social welfare agency, or the family of welfare agencies, which stands as guarantor to the client that the information given to a caseworker will be used for purposes deemed to be helpful to the client.

"Deemed to be helpful" by whom, is the question. By the social worker or by the client? And here we come face to face with that second concept that troubles us when we think about using collateral information, the concept of the client's right to self-determination. In terms of the issue under discussion here it is stated as the client's right to say whether he will or will not have his name entered in the confidential exchange and whether he will or will not have information about him exchanged between agencies; whether, in short, it is he or the social worker who decides what is helpful to him. Now it becomes necessary to reexamine what we mean by "self-determination." We affirm again that to determine what one wants to do, to live by the exercise of one's own will rather than by the will of another—these are the inalienable rights of free men. They are limited rights, of course, because in order that they shall be exercised by all they must be bounded by certain responsibilities of each individual to others and to the common will of the community as expressed in custom and law. But they are bounded

by even more than that. Our rights to self-determination are limited in many subtle ways of which we are not even conscious—by explicit or implicit expectations of us, by custom, by fashion, by ingrained habit. Full self-determination is an illusion; it is always closely limited. Actually, limits are necessary to our integrity and even to our survival. Our lives would be intolerable if we had to make a decision about each action we had to take. Our physical and mental energies would be totally dissipated, and we would be so busy exercising self-determination that there would be no possibility of focusing our thought and energy on new and major problems of living. The limits upon self-determination imposed by habits, customary procedures, decision of others which are impersonal and general in their application, are means by which we are freed to think and act in relation to significant problem-solving.

Self-determination is limited for all of us at those times when emotional stress or involvement is so great that our perception of what is realistic is dimmed, our understanding is dulled, or our perspective is distorted. At such times our capacity to be self-determining with judgment and objectivity is obviously impaired. The choices we make under such circumstances are not free choices; they are both shackled and distorted by anxiety.

Yet a third limitation lies on self-determination. True self-determination can only take place when we know the results or the meaning of the choice of action that we make. When an individual is not equipped by knowledge or clear understanding to judge what the consequences or implications of his choice will be, he is not free to choose. At such a time his choice may have to be to trust or not to trust what is accepted to be the responsible and more expert opinion of someone else. When, for example, I go to a doctor with pain in my chest I am in no way equipped to decide whether I will or will not have an X-ray, whether he should or should not consult with a colleague, whether he should or should not get a medical history from the doctor I saw last year. I expect the courtesy of his telling me that he will do this or that, or asking me if I have any objections, but I must assume that what he does is done out of his professional judgment that it will be helpful to me.

The relation between these few thoughts on the concepts of con-

fidentiality and self-determination and our thinking about seeking and giving information about a client between social agencies is readily apparent. The client who comes to a social agency is usually a person under stress. He assumes, or he must be helped to know, that he comes not to a private unlicensed person but to a chartered community agency, and that what he reveals will be held in confidence; that is, it will be responsibly guarded against misuse. In a situation of helplessness when the dangers of being subject to the powers of another are high, his rights to self-determination must be guarded. On the other hand, discrimination must be used as to what is and what is not realistically feasible for him to decide in the light of his inability to know the purpose of certain professional procedures or to judge their validity, and also because of the necessity that he be kept free to focus and work on the essential problems which bring him to the agency.

Underlying these considerations of philosophy and ethics, however, is one basic proposition: the exchange of information among social agencies must be useful in the interests of client or community welfare.² Here its value to the client himself is our focus of concern.

Perhaps one should say again what is generally accepted in good casework practice: the client himself should be the primary source of information about himself and his problem. When he crosses the social agency's threshold he surrenders no whit of his capacity to explain or discuss himself and his problem. Moreover, among the most vital facts of his situation are the facts of his feelings and reactions, and it is these which must be counted on as the dynamics in helping him. But there remain certain other facts of past and present circumstances and experiences which, when established between caseworker and client, serve to underpin, supplement, or clarify the immediate concern. It is such facts which are validly sought from other agencies. Their values to the client are these:

1. To promote the synchronizing of services offered by two or more agencies at one time
2. To prevent the disintegrating effects upon the individual of duplicate services

² See Towle, *op. cit.*

3. To speed up decisions as to what help is needed and by whom it can best be given
4. To deal adequately with a reality problem—or to establish reality—upon the foundation of established fact

But, one must ask, what about the client himself as informant to such purposes? There are many instances when the client is actually unable to be a reliable informant about himself or his situation. Such inability may have a number of sources. Those persons who are sick, dull, poorly oriented because of some chronic or temporary aberrations of their mental processes, who have language difficulties—all such persons may obviously be unable to account for themselves. The value of having some reliable means of establishing facts and connections here is patent.

Perhaps we encounter even more frequently those situations where the person's inability to report concurrent or past agency contacts which bear on the present one is due less to physical or mental sickness and more to the person's failure to connect or to relate one experience with another. For example, a woman brings to the family agency the complaint of her difficulties in getting along with her lazy husband. She is seeking a place where she can find sympathy and sustenance and she does not even connect this agency and what it can do with the psychiatric clinic in the big hospital where her husband goes every week for his "nervousness." It could be argued, of course, that good interviewing would bring this out, that a logical inquiry about what she and her husband had tried to do about the problem would reveal the hospital's activity. Perhaps it would, depending heavily on a number of factors, among them the woman's wish to recognize or to blot out the possibility that her husband is sick. Certainly a clearing would give immediate focus to the interview, would immediately raise the pertinent question as to whether greater helpfulness for this man and woman would lie in the one agency's concentration of help to both, or in cooperative work between the two agencies. However, even if the knowledge of the clinic were revealed by the client herself, the necessity for communication between these two agencies is readily seen. It might take more than "asking permission" of this woman to make this communication; it might take work in help-

ing her to see the logical relation between the service her husband is getting and the service she is requesting. It is such unconscious obliterations or simple misapprehensions about agencies which result in the client's actual inability to reveal the information vital to providing the help he seeks.

There are other situations where the client is able but unwilling to be a reliable informant. This is a statement which makes us uncomfortable, because of that feeling of having to believe that clients are all "good." But when one looks dispassionately at the situations in which people find themselves it is quite understandable why they should try to protect themselves by withholding certain information or even making false statements. The fact is that people who come to social agencies frequently feel that their very survival is at stake. The boy who is running away from what he considers an annihilating situation, the girl whose illegitimate pregnancy spells disaster to her, the woman who cannot make ends meet on submarginal relief—these people and others feel desperately threatened. The outright lie or the withheld truth is their way of protecting themselves, of fighting for survival. When fear is great, reason and even morality take second place in most human beings, so that this adolescent boy may understandably conceal the fact that the family agency has been working with him, and this girl may say that her home is a thousand miles away, and this woman may say that no one at all is helping her—indeed, this may even seem true to her though an aid to dependent children check comes in the mail once a month. In situations like these we see readily the value to the agency and the community in clearance and exchange of information, but we are sometimes less sanguine about the value to the client himself. If he is so afraid that he must lie, the argument goes, can we not rely on a good relationship to assuage that fear so that in time he will tell the truth about himself, and does it really matter whether for a short time he is getting help from two sources?

I believe there is harm to the client himself in such a situation and that there would be value to him in knowing that agencies use a clearance system for the exchange of information. It is human to lie, but it is also human to feel guilty and uncomfortable about it.

As a matter of fact, the kinder people are to us, the greater is our discomfort when we conceal from them, and the greater is our necessity to withdraw from the relationship or to complicate the fabrication. This in itself is harmful. Beyond this is the fact that help received from two sources at the same time when there is no understanding or joint operation between them is likely to be a disintegrating experience for the person involved. It is also true that help received from one source which is of the same nature as that received from another source at some previous time is likely to be reacted to in the light of the earlier experience. When that earlier experience is known and open between client and worker and discussed for its sameness with, or difference from, the current one, there is a better chance for a fresh start, cleansed of the filaments of the past.

The caseworker's responsibility to establish objective fact and the informant's concomitant temptation to withhold or distort it is most apparent, perhaps, in situations where the agency stands in some protective relationship to its primary client. To the child welfare agency, for example, comes the mother asking placement for her child; comes a man and woman wanting to adopt a baby. In such situations the agency's responsibility is primarily to the child under its protection. And in such situations the adults have strong reason to put their best foot forward, consciously or unconsciously to push for what they want. It would be inconceivable, even to the applicants, it seems to me, that such an agency should not attempt to use every ethical means at its disposal to determine the nature of the problems and people involved in these requests. It is quite true that when clearance reveals no social agency contacts the child welfare agency must depend heavily for its appraisal on its caseworker's skills of observation and interviewing; but in those situations where other social agency experience of relevance is recorded it would be flaunting common sense to overlook it as a means by which the margin of error might be narrowed and the possibility of accurate evaluation increased.

In yet another kind of situation does the interchange of social agency information hold considerable value to the client. This is the situation where immediate service is needed, and yet where

time or the circumstances under which interviewing is done do not permit building a bond of relationship between caseworker and client or permit the natural unfolding of the facts at the client's own pace. Large numbers of cases which come to social agencies are "referrals only" or "short contact only," either because only a one-time service is requested, or because a service other than what this agency can give is sought. In any of these situations, help must be made available as quickly and efficiently as possible within the limits of one short interview, often conducted under disturbing conditions. The services of appropriate referral or adequate emergency assistance and the avoidance of unrealistic planning and blind advice are made possible only by the quick exchange of data and thinking between agencies.

Finally, the seeking and use of information about a client from another agency promote the client's welfare in those situations where the collateral source has information in the nature of its special competence or expertness. A physician's recommendations, a psychologist's appraisal, a psychiatrist's diagnosis, a group worker's observations—all of these are in the nature of specialized professional data which the client cannot be expected to have or to report factually. Nor will the most discerning casework interview provide a substitute for them. Obviously, they need not be sought simply because they are expert testimonies; they are sought for their special or expert value when they are relevant to the problem in work between client and caseworker. Such data may be of inestimable value in promoting accurate and quickly achieved diagnosis and treatment planning and may obviate wearying repetitious processes on the part of the client.

Under all these circumstances, then, which occur singly or together in every kind of social agency, the exchange of information about clients between agencies is deemed to be useful to the welfare purposes of the client himself.

In the interests of careful evaluation it is important to look, too, at the limitations in the usefulness of collateral information. Perhaps the essential fact that needs recognition is that collateral information is collateral; that is, it was produced at another time, in another place, in relation to other circumstances and persons. It is

useful chiefly as it may throw light upon the firsthand information and interpretation given by the client here and now. There is no substitute for the direct interview with the client as the means of establishing his concept of his problem and of the help he wants. Nor, in evaluating the client's willingness and capacity to engage himself productively with this agency at this time, is there any information as valid as the worker's firsthand test of this. Collateral information must be seen, then, for what it is—a supplement to firsthand knowledge and planning, not a substitute for it.

Perhaps one further word should be said in noting the possible misuse of collateral information. There is a certain security for all of us in situations which have become static by virtue of their having been "settled" in the past. Moreover, there is a tendency in all of us to believe that which has been recorded to be "fact," and we are not so sure about the "truth" of a current living experience. We tend, then, to bank more heavily on the facts submitted by another agency than on the facts which we both witness and create, as if their "facts" were not also slanted by the focus of their inquiry, the expertness of their interviewers, and as if the past revealed the living human being more reliably than the present. Because of those phenomena in our striving for certainty we sometimes become overdependent on the past experiences of other agencies to enable us to appraise the client today. Collateral information may add corroborations to, or difference from, our diagnostic thinking. It cannot substitute for it.

When both the limitations and the values of the use of collateral information are seen and accepted there remains the further problem of the means to our ends; that is, there remains our need to consider what ways we can use which will promote our aim of usefulness to the client. The basic guarantee that the client's welfare will be promoted lies, of course, in the integrity of the agencies which are given the rights and responsibilities of membership in a confidential exchange. This should go without saying, and yet it is true and perhaps inevitable at this stage of social work's development that throughout the country there are agencies whose intent is good but whose professional competence has not yet been fully established. The problem is whether their standards are raised and

made secure by their being kept out of the company of the professionally sound agencies or by being drawn into association with them.

For the caseworker operating on his individual cases at a given time, however, the problem requires an individualized solution but in accordance with certain general principles. First among these is the necessity for an unsurprised recognition that for many reasons not every social agency will be at the same stage of development at the same time. Its function, its sources of support, its personnel—all of these will affect an agency's ability to give or to use information about a client. Some thirty-five years ago Mary Richmond warned, "To accept every statement of a social agency at its face value, to regard every professional opinion as equal in specific gravity to every other, may be a convenience . . . but the assumption can do the . . . clients grave injustice. . . ."² The caseworker then must evaluate with objective judgment the competence and dependability of the agency source from which information comes or to which it is to go.

Beyond this basic gauge there is the consideration of selecting which among a number of different agencies shall be communicated with. Recency in time of another agency's contact obviously speaks for possible relevance of its information to a current problem. The relationship of an agency's function to the immediate problem is another criterion for selection, since the function of an agency heavily determines the kinds of information it seeks and records. Such selectiveness automatically rules out all those forms which say, "We note your clearing . . ."; "Please send us a summary of your contact"—which is to say, "Send along whatever you've got. Maybe somehow, sometime, it will prove to be useful." It calls an end, too, to the practice of automatically sending out copies of letters once written for a specific purpose and now used as the carbon-copy responses to all inquiries whether they come from a home for the aged or a well-baby clinic. The thoughtful selection of what to send to whom and whom to ask for what would, in brief,

² Mary Richmond, *Social Diagnosis* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1917), p. 294.

serve as one means of guarding against useless or irresponsible exchange of information.

"What to ask for" or "what to send" should be appraised not alone in terms of agency function and standards and time considerations but even more basically in consideration of what kinds of information are necessary and useful to the particular problem at hand. This means that in each case the caseworker's first efforts must be directed to clarifying, together with the client, the nature of the particular problem for which he is asking this particular agency's help; or, to put it another way, the worker's task in the beginning steps of any case is to bring this client and his current problem into active relationship with this agency and its relevant services. When this is done it can be seen that collateral information should be sought only as it relates or promises to relate to the specific focus of client and agency concern at this time. We have lived with some lingering misconceptions in casework which have made us operate against this principle. One of these is that the more we know about a person or situation the more able we are to be helpful. This is obviously not true. It is possible to know so many things about a situation as to become lost in a welter of details, as to lose focus and direction. It is possible, too, to become so actively engaged in the pursuit of knowledge about a client that this becomes a substitute for the pursuit of the resolution of his problem. Therefore, if collateral information is to be used toward the resolution of the client's problem it must be asked for in relation to the agency's present focus of concern or interest and answered within that frame of reference. When this responsible selectivity becomes an habitual and characteristic way of seeking and giving information among social agencies perhaps what seem today to be problems of the ethics of a procedure may be seen in another perspective: that of problems of the good and poor usage of an intrinsically ethical procedure.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, maximum value in the use of collateral information will be insured by the caseworker's open sharing with the client himself the purpose for which it is sought and the value which it may have for him. Nobody wants to

be "checked"; and nobody wants another person to "find out about him" just in general. But if what is to be found out or even checked can be shown to have a relationship to promoting our welfare or meeting our needs there is scarcely one among us (unless we have something to hide) who would object to such an inquiry. The problem is not at all a problem of the technique by which the client's permission can be secured. It is rather the problem of the caseworker's being able adequately to explain to herself the reason for wanting to communicate with another agency about the client. When she herself is convinced that it has purpose in the conduct of the case the problem of sharing her thinking with her client is nine-tenths solved. The client's permission is truly volitional permission when he is clear about the reasons for his decision. Sometimes, however, his understanding will be only an understanding that what is done is thought to be necessary by a professionally trustworthy person. Permission in this instance is granted out of trust. Sometimes permission cannot be secured. In such instances, with rare exceptions, the reasons for what must be done or what has had to be done should be brought into the discussion between worker and client.

In social workers' thinking about the use of collaterals there has recurred the argument that the caseworker can rarely put to constructive use information which the client does not know she has. This is generally quite true. But it is not an argument against the use of collateral sources of information. It is rather an argument for better methods in its use. Bringing the client into recognition of the relevance of information from other sources to the solving of his today's problem—when there is such relevance—or, at the very least, making him cognizant of the agency's rationale for seeking such information—when that rationale is valid—is one of the most effective ways by which collateral information can be converted to vital use in the concerns and decisions of client and worker.

It has seemed to me that in order to clarify our theories and practices in the use of collaterals these considerations are important: our emotions about the instrument of the social service exchange and of protectiveness of the client against that instrument need to

be faced and examined for their validity. In our thinking, which will affect those feelings, we need to pierce the shell of certain concepts which have become shibboleths among us, seek for the core of their actual meaning, and try to establish their particular relationship to social casework practice. I refer especially to the concepts of confidentiality and self-determination and to the concept of professional authority as a counterpart of professional responsibility. It is only as our feeling is accounted for and our operational philosophy is clarified that we are ready to identify the useful purposes which information from collateral sources may serve the client himself. These purposes, in the large, are the facilitation and the integration of the help that is given him. Cognizance must be taken, too, of the limitations in the use of secondary sources. Finally, since the end must preexist in the means, the ways in which collateral information is used will heavily determine whether in general and in the individual case it will be of small or great value in promoting the joined purposes of agency and client.

Modern Casework Recording: Integrating Casework and Supervision

By MARGUERITE M. MUNRO

OUR PROFESSION HAS BEEN PLAGUED FOR YEARS with problems of dictating and recording. We have talked, written, and debated the subject—but we have stopped short of effective action. This is borne out by the evidence of repetitive discussions and articles presenting ever recurring problems. I shall not approach this subject from the angle of the record as an entity, or from the point of view of dictation as an administrative problem. I want to focus on recording as an integrated part of total casework practice. I want to stress its dynamic potentialities for sharpening diagnostic skill, furthering the caseworker's developmental progress, and facilitating the supervisory process. In this way I hope to indicate a means of making more widely available the professional skills contained in any agency.

What I shall discuss is not theory, though it does involve theoretical considerations. I shall present, rather, some convictions of one agency which has worked actively and consistently with the problem over a two-year period and has begun to see partial results and definite trends. I shall present no formulas, but merely share an experience, in order to depict what can happen if an agency has the courage to break through established patterns, trusting its own integrity and professional standards sufficiently to believe that out of the process a new and more vital *modus operandi* can come into being.

In this process it is essential that agency and staff be willing to free themselves from an habitual clinging to status quo and honestly evaluate the elements involved. It is necessary to ask such basic questions as these: What is the actual, as opposed to theoretical, usefulness of the case record to the caseworker? To the supervisor?

To the agency? Are all records used in the same way? If not, should all records be set up in the same way? Are the time and money currently spent in dictating, transcribing, and reading records in line with value received? Is a record written long after the event of more than theoretical value? What is the basis for the general resistance to recording? How can records become an integrated part of the vital, productive activity of the agency? If these questions are frankly asked and honestly answered by conscientious professional people, it will no longer be possible for us to accept the recording standards now prevalent.

I shall have to exclude from this discussion the questions which are not related to the real and potential value of the case record to those most directly involved in dispensing the agency's services, the caseworker and the supervisor.

Recording was originally the tool of the caseworker. Its basic function continues to be hers to utilize as a means of achieving continuity with individual clients, as a basis for critical study of practice, and as an indication of problem areas when seeking supervisory help. As the caseworker develops, she relives, in her use of the case record, the experience of the profession; we need not expatiate on this, except to contrast her need for records in her various stages of progress. As a beginning student she records everything that occurs in the interview, because she does not yet know what is important or relevant. As she begins to be selective in her responses to the client, she is likely to be unsure of what she is doing and record every detail in order that her emphasis may be tested by subsequent experience or in conference with her supervisor. As she moves into greater confidence in her own skill and can begin to operate somewhat independently, her immediate concern is not with the mass of material itself, but with the client's purpose in introducing it and how she can most effectively work with this elusive purpose. However, she may question her interpretation or the appropriateness of her response and may still need to record material in more or less detail in order to have it available for future study, or to present to her supervisor. When, however, the caseworker is able to get immediately to the client's problem through the material presented, sees him beginning to work with his prob-

lem, and feels confident of her own direction, her purposes can be served by merely stating the actual process of the interview, with a minimum of detail, a note-taking type of recording. Let me illustrate:

Miss G. in office. Focus was her inability to relate well to people, her feeling this is due mostly to sense of inferiority. Discussion of results: usually very hostile, cuts people short, sarcastic, no really satisfactory relationship with anyone, unhappy about this. I recognized her dissatisfaction; presence here evidence of wanting to change this; how could she accomplish this? She hoped I would accomplish this. As we talked this over, it became apparent to Miss G. that this attitude was continuation of usual pattern; gives everybody else responsibilities for situation, makes little effort to put anything into it; example, when uncomfortable withdraws into silence, waits for people to talk to her, etc. Felt wanted to experiment with putting self more into situation, trying to be a little more friendly and participating in conversation with people. Results to be discussed in next interview.

This interview has certain elements of an intake interview. Space does not permit inclusion of an intake interview, which, because of its very nature, often contains more factual material than subsequent interviews and, because of its imminent assignment to a different worker, usually requires somewhat detailed treatment. Nevertheless, experiment has demonstrated that a skilled intake worker can record a meaningful interview adequately for a continuing worker to use it effectively with a maximum of one page of recording.

This interview which high-lights movement is adequate for the caseworker's immediate purpose; it will be adequate for her later purpose of reviewing continuing movement, or lack of it. If it is not to be used for supervision, teaching, or research, it has also met the agency's requirements. It offers the added advantage of making it possible for the recording to be done in a very few moments following the interview, thus making the record available and, at the same time, conserving more of the worker's time for direct service to clients.

We have at this point come face to face with one of the most frequently evaded paradoxes in our attitude toward recording. We have consistently adhered to the maxim that the fundamental pur-

pose of the record is the caseworker's use of it, yet I question whether she has ever been allowed to feel this or act upon it. Burdened with responsibility for total recall, she has frequently postponed dictation indefinitely, devoting herself to aspects of the job which have meaning and significance for her. When records have had significance, however, for supervision or other specific purposes, these have been promptly dictated. Too frequently she has not made practical use of her records because, (a) they were not dictated; (b) they were too long to tackle; or (c) she has not been helped to write records which were useful to her.

The soundness of the caseworker's proverbial resistance to recording has not been readily enough recognized. She is a skilled, professional person, interested in developing and using her skills to the utmost. She is rightfully annoyed by unnecessary deterrents from the use of this skill. While verbally accepting the agency's dictum she has often passively revolted by simply by-passing dictation; yet her revolt has created guilt, and she has punished herself by spending hours of overtime bringing her dictation up to date.

A diagnostic approach to recording leaves with the caseworker a responsibility which is rightfully hers, that of evaluating her interviews in terms of movement. If the interview shows no movement, she is aware of this and asks herself why. However, if the recording process is primarily a matter of recall, the challenge to evaluate is less immediate and she can easily overlook, in the wealth and richness of the material, the fact that this material is often relatively meaningless in the absence of any utilization of it in the interview. Recording can become one of the most expedient and practical means by which the caseworker grasps and evaluates the extent of her responsibility in the helping process. It can become for her, likewise, an index by which she is helped to ascertain areas wherein she needs help. Experience has shown that this approach results in a perceptible and consistent sharpening of skill in practice.

Although the initial and basic purpose of the case record evolved from the practitioner's need, the supervisor was immediately alert to the use she too could make of it as a tool for developing and implementing her own role and her own skills. Supervision was, in its

infancy, as undefined as casework. It consisted primarily of a combination of administrative and teaching functions, and the supervisor, often untrained, but usually experienced, was concerned with teaching administrative procedures. It was by means of the case record that she was able to verify the implementation of these procedures, and it was essential that so basic a tool, if it were to be effective, must be complete and detailed. I shall limit myself to a contrast with the supervisor's present role and her relatively different use of the case record.

One basic difference in the supervisor's present milieu is the difference in her supervisee. Although she may still be young, the modern caseworker is usually not untrained; she has already acquired basic professional concepts and a basic quota of supervised experience. Consequently, although teaching continues to be an important part of the supervisor's responsibility, it assumes a proportionately different importance when the supervisee is a person who is already professional in outlook, in her concept of herself, in her intent, and in her capacity to assume responsibility. Even the beginning worker expects to become an increasingly responsible member of the agency staff, and this expectation is expressed by the agency as well in its criteria for evaluation. As the caseworker moves from one stage of experience to another, the supervisor is less intent on teaching and more intent on helping her develop and use the capacity and skill she has demonstrated, so that she may carry more aspects of the job independently and use the supervisor more discriminately.

Another ingredient is the supervisor herself, whose skill has developed simultaneously with that of the caseworker, and, just as the caseworker can more quickly break through content which the client brings, the supervisor is able to ascertain more readily the attitudes, conflicts, and resistances of the caseworker. Both supervisor and caseworker have thus developed to the point where content is not meaningful in itself, but as a clue to the purpose, the effort, the protectiveness, which motivate or impede the use of the self in relation to factors of daily existence. How much, then, does the supervisor need of the content of the individual case situation in order to help the worker develop skill in helping clients?

The time element must be considered here because the compelling interest of the supervisor, like that of the caseworker, is in having as much time as possible available for the significant, creative aspects of her job, and she too is rightfully resentful of time spent in unproductive gestures. Her time is not effectively used in wading through irrelevant content, digging for material she needs in order to help the caseworker. At the same time, prior knowledge of significant content and the worker's evaluation of it, as indicated in the trend of the case movement, save valuable conference time. This time can be more productively spent in discussing crucial and important aspects of the worker's thinking and practice than in the worker's narrating events of the interview. The balance to be achieved will vary with the skill of the caseworker, the skill of the supervisor, and the complexity of the case situation.

A young worker with a limited degree of discerning, discriminating skill finds it difficult to select content which carries and illustrates the process. In order that the supervisor may help her learn to do this, it is necessary that they evaluate together details of the interview's content. A more mature worker need illustrate the process with only enough content to provide meaning, as she is more able to respond quickly to the give-and-take between herself and the supervisor and reach into unrecorded content to build up the discussion.

A beginning supervisor does not immediately learn to transfer interviewing skills which she learned as a caseworker, not only because she finds herself faced with new fears and new threats with which she must cope emotionally, but also because she is not yet sure what supervision is, has not yet achieved a fine balance between the teaching and relationship aspects of supervision. For her the fuller record serves as a ballast, something she can hold to while finding herself in her new role and developing her skills. A mature supervisor does not need this ballast but is able to utilize directly in the conference all her skill in interviewing, in understanding and evaluating problems and limitation, growth, and skill. She can function with a minimum of record content.

If these criteria are sound, we will find an ever changing ratio in the recording of content. If this does not happen, there is need

to reevaluate the total supervisor-supervisee situation, since it may be that either the supervisor, or the supervisee, or both, have ceased to develop. In general, I would say that in a relationship between a skilled supervisor and a skilled worker, the usual record presented for conference should be exceedingly brief, though more complete than that not used for supervision. New types of situations, or those which elude the caseworker's understanding, require a fuller type of recording than may be usual.

I feel that, in general, cases regularly used in supervision should be dictated interview by interview, in order that a record may be available when needed for conference, rather than conferences determined by a recording plan. However, I have selected, for expediency, a summary which I consider adequate for use in supervision.

Miss T. had applied for help in breaking away from the suffocating influence of the aunt and uncle with whom she had lived following her discharge from a foster home. Her problem soon centered, however, around her relationship with a young man with whom she was in love, though he did not share her desire for marriage. Her contacts with the agency had been erratic, unfocused, and unproductive until the avowed emphasis had changed from a vague "relationship with men" to problems she felt in growing up. This is a summary of five contacts during the following month:

Miss T. was seen weekly. There was marked change, even in the first interview, a quieter manner and serious focusing on the problem of "growing up." She did not once have to bring in anything about the family, and when I mentioned this, she acknowledged that she seemed to have been able to give up fighting them. She examined her interest in men and found that she was attracted to a man only if he were outstanding, yet she feared such an outstanding person would lose interest in her after a while. She relegated to relative unimportance such qualities as a man's capacity for loyalty, tenderness, and consideration, feeling that these could be sought for later. This started her looking at whether she was really wanting an enduring relationship with a man, and, after examining her many current contacts, as well as touching on past experiences, she concluded with some surprise that her last thought at this time was marriage, even though in fantasy it still seemed desirable with Jimmy. She was able to make connection between her now

revealed negative attitude toward marriage and her early experience. She always remembered her father as ill with heart trouble and dominated by his mother, who lived near and who had arranged his marriage. There were other elements as well in her early and subsequent experience, including that of her immediate relatives, which would account for reluctance to enter into marriage. She was able to decide that some day she might want to assume the responsibilities attending marriage, although currently she was very definite about not wanting them.

During these weeks, Miss T. began to perceive with great clarity her evident drive to get herself hurt by men, avoiding relations where there was little danger. During the month she twice only narrowly decided to avoid two quite dangerous situations she had really gone out of her way to create.

Recognition of her failure to take responsibility for her health pointed up sharply for her a generally lax and rather helpless attitude toward herself.

This record of five interviews, recorded on one half of one side of a record page, gives the essentials needed in supervision. We are clear about the direction in which the case is moving and from the movement we can tell how clear the caseworker is about her own role. She might easily have dictated several paragraphs explaining the elements in Miss T.'s experience which account for reluctance to enter marriage, but this would make a doubtful contribution to the record's usefulness to the supervisor. This material is rich in possibilities for discussion; it is stated with sufficient clarity that the overtones and undertones are available to the discerning supervisor.

It is obvious that if a supervisor is willing to accept this type of record from her caseworkers she has clearly and honestly faced the whole problem of relative responsibility between her role and that of the caseworker she is supervising. She has had to give up to the caseworker a major part of the responsibility for the case. In so doing, she has conveyed more clearly than by words her respect for the professional ability and integrity of the caseworker. She has also had to redefine her own area of responsibility and reevaluate her own skill in working within a relationship wherein she carries primarily a responsibility for seeing the worker's problems and help-

ing her find ways of handling them. The great gain is that this relationship has superseded the case record as the primary, most useful implement available for her use.

I cannot leave this subject without recognizing that in any approach to problems of recording, administrative leadership is fundamentally essential. The agency's administrator must be clear as to relative values. He must be sensitive to emotional reactions produced by change in procedures and to threats inherent in a shifting balance of responsibility. He must recognize that it can be hard for a caseworker to assume new responsibilities, even though she wants them, and that it is also hard for a supervisor to give up responsibility, even though her primary interest is in the caseworker's development.

Recording can become truly a pivot in agency structure, one of the means by which balances are created and maintained, skills are developed, performance enriched. This potentiality becomes a reality only when an agency moves boldly from alternate lamentation and theorizing into action, takes the bull by the horns, and begins to work for results. I am convinced that we have outgrown our old patterns of recording and I hope we have the courage to give them up and apply to this aspect of our performance the same degree of creativity we are so accustomed to applying elsewhere in our practice.

Current Emphases in Casework under Religious Auspices

I. INTEGRATION OF CASEWORK AND OTHER PROGRAMS

By HENRY J. WHITING

THERE IS AN ANCIENT LEGEND which tells the story of a wise man who was given the opportunity to ask of a sphinx any question he might wish. He was given the further boon that the answer received would be absolutely true. After many days of contemplation, we are told, the wise man put this question: "Is the universe friendly?"

From the dawn of time man has persistently raised this fundamental of all questions. In a world of confusion and crisis man still asks, even pleads, "Is the universe friendly?"

What answers are being given? What answers can be given? Social agencies under religious auspices see in the present world situation evidences of deep human need. There are, we believe, some developing emphases in church-related agencies which hold significant promise for the future.

The last quarter century has witnessed events of profound import to the art and skill of helping people in trouble. We have come a long way since the early days of "charities and correction" when material and cash relief, custodial care, environmental manipulation, were dominant aspects of social work. There are still large areas where these factors continue to form the content of social work, but the helping professions are moving into a new era of understanding and insight.

Largely responsible for many of these significant developments

are the contributions of psychiatry and related fields. We now recognize the dynamics of interpersonal relationships. We approach the human being in trouble with profound humility, mindful of our great need for more understanding and insight. Psychiatry and related fields have made us sharply aware of, and sensitive to, the deeps in personality. Out of these deeps emerge guilt, anxiety, and hostility which will not be denied. They must not only be "handled," they must be resolved if we are to achieve wholesome living. We are aware that we must give our energies to those values which build and conserve human capacities and resources.

Some sectarian agencies see in these developments new need and validation for integrating the dynamics of religion in casework. Many believe that within the content of the Judaeo-Christian religious heritage are found resources by which we may effectively deal with fear, anxiety, and hostility. All these religions give primary emphasis to faith in a Power outside of and beyond man, whose love seeks to redeem man and prepare him for a life which endures. Here we have a Source for faith with which to meet anxiety, redemption to resolve guilt, and love to deal with hostility.

It does not follow that all casework must be under religious auspices, but such a setting, we believe, offers fuller opportunity for integrating the dynamics of religion into the helping and healing therapies. Moreover, recognize as we must the variety of religious groups in a democracy, it would seem that this integration, for the present at least, can best be clinically explored and developed in an agency under religious auspices. We hold that in the light of these new insights, religion cannot continue to be regarded as a fifth wheel to be kept in the trunk compartment. Religion is the great power for wholesome, mature living and must be fused with the driving wheels of living today.

These new insights make requisite a continuing reexamining of methods and goals in casework generally, but especially in casework under religious auspices. There are still too many church-related agencies which through deliberate choice or indifference ignore these new insights in the dynamics of human behavior.

Too many sectarian institutions provide only custodial care for children. Some institutions under religious auspices, however, are

beginning to explore the more meaningful use of institutions as residential treatment centers for children with behavior problems. These agencies are exploring new frontiers where the dynamics of religion may be integrated with other therapies. In the field of child placement, children are being placed earlier, and into foster homes where they may experience the security and acceptance of parents who love them sincerely and where religious values are present.

Programs for unwed parents, and we use the term "parents" deliberately, offer rich opportunities for development of rehabilitative services. At a maternity home operated by the Lutheran Welfare Society of Minnesota, significant results are being demonstrated through close teamwork of chaplain, caseworker, and nurse. There is need for adequate medical care, shelter, and help in planning for the infant. But the deep emotional needs of unwed parents are not ignored. Where guilt, anxiety, and hostility are present, redemptive religious faith with its restorative power is offered through individual pastoral care and group worship.

A growing number of people are deeply concerned over the widespread secularism, behaviorism, humanistic determinism, and moral decadence in our society. Admittedly, there are determining factors within man and society which shape us. Carried to its extreme, however, this humanistic determinism reduces man to a robot. Religion, and the moral concepts which rest upon it, gives man dignity and worth as a creature of God. Herein are to be found the bases for self-motivation and self-direction without which there can be no casework.

There appears to be a revival of interest in church-related welfare services. We believe that this represents more than an interesting social phenomenon. We believe it represents a conviction on the part of many that the present world crisis is essentially a moral crisis and that moral and religious values must not be divorced from welfare services. Here again we cannot precisely outline patterns by which these moral and religious values may be effectively related to welfare services. Certainly it does not mean that all casework must be directly under sectarian auspices. That is not realistically attainable in a democratic society. We plead here, however, for creative and imaginative planning so that many patterns may

result. The particular pattern is important only as it contributes to the end objective of preserving moral and religious values in our democratic society.

In *The Mature Mind*, H. A. Overstreet comments, "What has been joined together in human nature can be put asunder only for the purpose of research. Sooner or later, it must be rejoined for purposes of living." In the past century, which witnessed the ascendancy of the scientific method, we have been doing considerable tearing asunder for purposes of research. We have gathered a mass of fact and information but we have failed to relate life and all its parts into meaningful and purposeful wholes.

Institutions of religion must here share guilt with other areas of society. Man has been trichotomized into body, mind, and spirit. The church, too often, has indicated its area of interest and concern to be the "spiritual," leaving the other parts to other professional therapists.

There is a growing concern in church-related agencies to view man as a whole. Essentially, there is no area of life beyond the concern of the church since man in his totality is a creature of God. Moreover, there is a growing conviction that it is perilous for the church to allow itself to be relegated to one segment of life. We have seen in totalitarian Germany the tragic consequences of such compartmentalization. There the church was told it could have freedom to operate so long as it remained in the sphere of religion and divorced itself from other significant areas—education, social welfare, labor relations, economics.

This does not mean that the church as the church must need dominate all of human society, or any segment of it. That would be theocracy, which is alien to our American democracy. Nor does it mean that the present helping professions—psychiatry, medicine, social work, the ministry, to mention only a few—need now be merged into some new profession. That would be neither possible nor desirable.

Persuaded that the resources of religion are valid and meaningful, many sectarian agencies see themselves as clinical facilities for exploring professional teamwork and delineating areas of responsibility of each profession. It does appear that this clinical approach

offers the most fruitful means for such exploratory study. Here in a clinical setting are to be found living people, human beings with hopes and fears, love and hostility, as indivisible wholes.

It may be said that such professional teamwork can be explored equally well in agencies under nonsectarian auspices. This may be true. At present, however, it appears that those who have a conviction on the meaningful role of the dynamics of religion in the therapy process must bear responsibility for clinical demonstration.

Other professions have found it necessary to develop in their educational curriculum clinical facilities which provide practice in the arts and skills of the particular discipline. Theological seminaries are beginning to use clinical training centers where seminarians may secure training in the art and skills of pastoral care. Just as in other professional disciplines primary responsibility rests with the school, here primary responsibility for basic educational curricula rests with the theological seminary. The training center is primarily a service agency and secondarily offers itself as a clinical facility.

Training centers had their origin in general hospitals, mental hospitals, and correctional institutions. Recently, however, they have been extended in a few instances to casework and group work agencies. Agencies under religious auspices are just beginning to be used as centers for clinical training in pastoral care, but already standards for clinical training are being prepared and accepted.

We are persuaded that the movement holds much significance for the future role of the clergyman as well as for sectarian social agencies. The clergyman thus trained will be more sensitive to human need and undoubtedly will possess deeper insights in the causative factors in human behavior. Moreover, through such a training program the clergyman will be able to delineate more sharply his role in the team of professional therapists. And finally, the clergyman will possess a more thorough and intelligent understanding of community resources.

With the close of the Second World War, mountainous human needs were found in those areas which had experienced or were adjacent to military operations. Millions of people had been uprooted from their homes, whole communities suddenly mush-

roomed with refugees, and there was desperate need for food, clothing, medical care, and essential community services. Although governmental and voluntary agencies, national and international, rushed aid, it soon became evident that the churches had significant contributions to make. Representatives of church groups went to Europe to survey needs and determine how the services of church-related agencies could be integrated into the developing programs.

It was natural that a first concern of American churches was to reestablish relations with their own faith groups and seek to rebuild the indigenous church programs. In large areas in Germany the church was the only institution which survived the otherwise total collapse of national and local organized community life. If the German people were to possess those qualities which would lead to their reacceptance into the family of democracies, it was recognized that the church had a significant role to play in the strengthening of necessary religious and moral values. The contribution of the American churches to rebuilding the spiritual life of the German people cannot be overestimated. This was carried forward in a number of ways—reconstruction of churches, distribution of literature, training programs for church workers.

The various church groups also supplemented welfare services carried on by international and national governmental and voluntary agencies. Material aid in cash, food, and medical supplies was gathered in America and made available to indigenous German church-related welfare agencies. The Christian Rural Overseas Program has gathered millions of dollars of farm products from rural areas, sending them to Europe and around the world.

The resettlement of displaced persons and refugees and the placement of war orphans have been significant undertakings developed by sectarian agencies as they facilitated an operation carried on by the International Refugee Organization and our own federal agencies. Literally a worldwide network of welfare services was established by various church groups as they carried forward the resettlement of their people in America, Canada, Israel, South America, Australia, and elsewhere.

The United States State Department, assisted by church groups, has made it possible for many nationals engaged in social work in

Germany to visit America in order to observe social welfare here. A number of German students have also matriculated in American schools of social work and carried back something of our philosophy and practice.

Some very interesting and far-reaching by-products have come out of these welfare services. As indicated, the organization and structure of international welfare services under religious auspices have been strengthened. Of course, hospitals and clinics, services to abandoned and neglected children, special services to the handicapped, have always been a vital part of the foreign mission programs of various faith groups. The war-related programs have demonstrated the effective role to be played by social work in developing human services. The common religious bond held by particular religious groups may yet point the way to peaceful understanding among the peoples of the earth.

In recent years there has developed great concern for community-wide welfare services under governmental or voluntary auspices. It is said that these services should be made available to all people "without discrimination as to race or religious affiliation." In many respects, this is indeed a very lofty and worthy objective. The advocates of this position often view with chagrin and dismay the continued development of social welfare services under religious auspices. We are told that sectarian programs segmentize the community and negate, if not destroy, any possibility of achieving unity in community-wide programming. It is perhaps unnecessary to add that "religious auspices" are not the only differentiating factor among community groups.

Here a note of caution must be sounded. We view with deep concern any development of communitarianism which would level off the differences which exist in our American democratic society. Any such communitarianism is dangerous and alien to democracy.

It was precisely this philosophy which prompted some of the first steps taken by totalitarianism in Germany. The second steps were efforts to achieve a single national education, national welfare, and other significant aspects of community and national life. And then, with government in the hands of a diabolical small group who violated all human rights, tragic consequences resulted.

Rather than segmentizing the community, these religious groups stand as champions of the liberties of any group in a democratic society—racial, political, economic, or otherwise. Einstein is reported to have said that when National Socialism began to creep across Germany he first looked to journalism, only to be disappointed. Later he looked to the universities, long reported advocates of academic freedom, but again he was disappointed. Much to his surprise it was the churches of Germany that put up the most effective resistance to the terrifying efforts of the Nazis to cut human beings down to fit a single national mold.

As we have said, there are people who are deeply concerned, when they observe some social agencies seeking to offer a rehabilitative service without regard to moral and religious values. Because they have a conviction that there can be no truly helpful rehabilitation without these values, they feel they have not only a right, but a duty to carry forward casework under religious auspices or at least to seek means for their coordination with casework. This may be why we have witnessed a resurgence of sectarian social work.

But what is the relation of agencies under religious auspices to the total community? Certainly their autonomy and consequent freedom must be regarded as a trusteeship. It should not mean withdrawal, insulation from the community.

In a dynamic democratic society, we will avoid any rigid categorical division of areas of responsibility and consequent definition of function. A religious group, sensitive and alert to human need, will assay the needs and evaluate available resources and then develop a program. It is indeed regrettable that many voluntary agencies, sectarian and nonsectarian, are but adding categorical services in a community already weighed down with categories in governmental welfare services.

The religious group will use its autonomy and freedom constructively and with creative imagination seek to serve people. It will not allow itself to bog down in its own area, insulated from real human need and existent resources. The particular function or service will vary with this dynamic approach from community to community in accordance with need and resources.

We have come a long way in social work practice in the last twenty-five years. We have grown numerically so that social work stands today as the most rapidly developing profession in America. New areas for the use of our skills and insights are being revealed constantly. We are developing a literature. We have developed professional education.

But social work still has a long way to go before attaining the degree of community recognition now enjoyed by medicine, law, the ministry, education. The resistance to legislation providing for regulation of practice, the lack of full acceptance of fees for service, are indicative.

There are obstacles to this acceptance of recognized standards of social work practice, but space permits comment only on those which relate to welfare services under religious auspices. The parish pastor among most religious groups has been accepted as family counselor. It must be remembered that in a number of groups this role of the clergy is very real and deeply inculcated in the minds of the people. Certainly we would not want to disrupt or negate this highly motivated pastoral concern of a clergyman for his people. It can be seen, then, that the development of a new helping profession such as social work would be resisted unless there is clear demarcation of the roles of each and good interprofessional relationships established based on integrity and confidence. Moreover, there is still general lack of insight and understanding into the depths and complexity of human behavior. Many people tend to oversimplify the dynamics of human behavior and interpersonal relationships and therefore see no need for professionally trained staff.

Still another factor is the deeply rooted voluntarism imbedded and encouraged in religious groups. Within the framework of our Judaeo-Christian religious tradition and its ethical demands upon the sincerely religious person, we seek to motivate people into offering themselves in service to others. All these religious groups are constantly exhorting their followers, and properly so, to serve their fellow men. How can these volunteers serve in a community whose social agencies are seeking to develop professional standards of so-

cial work practice? We believe there is room for both, but the dilemma is critically in need of resolution.

Added to this is the wide diversity of skills and competency among those engaged in social work. We are aware of this and learn to work in such a setting, but how confusing it must be to those outside the field. To them we are all social workers whether we possess a master's degree from an accredited graduate school or have no training whatsoever. There is a similar attitude in regard to social agencies, which differ not only in their competency but in their particular function.

There is, however, a growing acceptance of recognized standards in social work practice in sectarian agencies. Their very belief in the worth and immortality of the individual is making requisite the skill and insights of qualified personnel. There are still too many agencies and institutions without staff of adequate quality and number. But more and more agencies are recognizing the need to engage staff in sufficient number and qualified by training and personal qualities. There has been a remarkable increase in the number of scholarships for graduate study offered by church groups to meet this need.

Social services under religious auspices are being strengthened and extended. Without being blind to weak spots and areas of need let us not be unmindful of the substantial progress that has been and is being made.

II. DEVELOPMENTS IN CASEWORK PROGRAMS

By *KATHARINE E. GRIFFITH*

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A CASEWORK PROGRAM under any auspices depends upon various factors, among which are: the need for the service; the understanding, direction, and guidance from members of the community; the appropriateness of the agency to

develop it, the stability of that agency; the availability of qualified staff; and adequate financial support.

By no means a study of the development of all casework programs under all religious auspices, this paper is derived mainly from the practices of the Diocesan Bureau of Social Service of Hartford, Connecticut, and of several other programs of Catholic Charities.

All Catholic social work stands on the Christian premise of man's divine origin, purpose, and destiny, and the emphasis in the development of a program will vary according to the strengths and weaknesses of the factors enumerated above. Sectarian agencies are largely engaged in family and child welfare, although there are activities for youth, many health services, and much of the care of the aged is under religious auspices. Sectarian agencies engaged in family and children's work welcome the development in these other areas since we know that casework programs need the supportive and interrelated efforts of many other services.

We were one of the fortunate diocesan casework agencies which early in its organization emphasized work with the family as well as attention to the child in need of foster care. Although our agency was established in 1916, when relief was the greater part of any private agency program, from the very beginning the service features were emphasized. In recent years, family casework programs have been organized and strengthened in many diocesan agencies due to the pressures which have tended to erode the foundations of the home and menace its solidarity, revealing the urgent need for skillful treatment of the family economically, emotionally, and spiritually threatened.

In general, the objectives of a sectarian agency are the same as those of any responsible agency engaged in skilled casework practice, namely, direct services to individuals and families and leadership in community-wide planning for social action. In direct service, effort is made to arrive at an understanding and identification of the needs and to determine whether or not, and how, these needs can be met through the individual's own resources, by those within the agency, through parish or diocesan opportunities, by other

agencies in the community, or possibly through a combination of many services. By reason of its heritage of religious truths, its insight into religious experience, problems, and aspirations, its access to Christian concepts and to the sacramental system of such vital importance to its clientele, the practice and programing of our agency draw not only on the usual community resources but upon all these opportunities for spiritual growth.

The degree to which direct services are achieved is dependent upon the vision and flexibility of administration and the qualifications of staff members. As we know, rigid administration can limit and curtail services to individuals. Without flexibility an agency accomplishes little of a preventive nature.

Until about ten years ago our agency operated on departmentalized lines, adhering, somewhat rigidly, to an artificial line between family and children's services. As family disorganization rather than specific factors increasingly accounted for the majority of requests for foster placement of children, we decided to wipe out these lines of demarcation and use the services of our agency and of the community to meet the total need rather than shifting the family or individual back and forth between departments. When the staff was oriented to this type of approach we obtained, much more readily, a picture of the needs of any one neighborhood or parish and we could use much more effectively our knowledge as a casework agency in a central body for social planning.

For instance, reports from educational, recreational, social, and health agencies indicated the need for mobilization and coordination of neighborhood effort in order to effect a constructive social change in one of the trouble areas of our city. An examination of the current case loads of the private agencies indicated that the area was populated by families of low, marginal, or just above marginal income and that anxiety, frustration, indifference, laxness in behavior, aggression, hostility, were taking high toll in family separation, neglect of children, antisocial behavior. Spiritual vitality was far from vigorous in this area, but the population was about 50 percent Catholic. The establishment of a district office was welcomed by leaders in that particular community. The plan was devised by the executives of the nonsectarian family agency and the

Catholic Charities. Workers of both agencies have headquarters in the same building and use joint clerical staff. The facilities have expanded so that the office is now used by staff from Aid to Dependent Children and Old Age Assistance for their work at a local level. There is a healthy give and take between several agencies. We have come to understand many of the problems confronting workers in our public services, and I am sure that through their association with staff members of a private agency they have come to feel greater ease in asking for cooperative relationships on a case basis.

We are considering a similar extension of service in another area of the city, near a large public housing project. We believe that this kind of partnership with other agencies and resources is healthy and in no way confusing to the client or submerging of agency function. Pastors, schoolteachers, principals, public agencies, and health organizations have indicated their interest in the extension of this service as an opportunity to discuss complicated situations and learn just what community resources might be helpful to the family or individual in developing his own potentialities.

One of the objectives of our casework programs is to implement and supplement the work of the parish. In the early thirties we opened a neighborhood office in a section badly hit by the depression. In those days possibly our chief aim was supplying through public and private resources financial means to keep a family together. As assistance from public agencies became more adequate, our main service was directed toward fostering independent use of these services rather than building up dependency upon the private agency. Through intensive work with the pastor and with the sisters in the parochial schools we were able to do this and at the same time to indicate what situations might best be met through our own services. The progress in these educational efforts was so fruitful that about a year ago we closed this neighborhood office with the confidence that services would be requested from the main office. It was then administratively possible to place workers from this office in another area in which there were few social resources and where, due to the impact of our industrial mobilization, the population had tripled in the past five years.

Since the expansion of public services to families and children

our agency has concentrated much of its attention on working out policies of functional relationship with governmental agencies. As individual members of a community and as Catholics we could not divest ourselves of the responsibility for personal service when relief needs were delegated to growing public agencies. Hence, while adequate financial assistance does meet some of the major necessities for adequate living, it does not solve the problems of lack of fruitful companionship, social recreation, vocational and employment counseling, skilled service in individual and family rehabilitation, child care and training, healthy personal growth, and spiritual revitalization.

The major emphasis in Catholic social work continues to be focused on child care. With the expanding ADC program, more children have been kept with one parent or with relatives under circumstances where placement would formerly have been the only immediate direct service. The growth of this program has also meant that many children who were living away from their own families and relatives have found the secure and loving care of family life. Any sectarian agency makes its real contribution in safeguarding the spiritual welfare of its children. Through cooperative planning with the public services the sectarian voluntary agency has a fruitful field for constructive service.

At the present time our agency retains on a cooperative casework basis many families that are transferred to the public services for financial aid once eligibility has been established. We know that this type of service is welcomed by the family and by the public agency. However, we know that no one problem is separate and apart from emotional reactions and complications. Therefore, it requires the greatest skill to develop this kind of service. To provide this cooperative service and achieve the mutual objectives of client and worker—realization of the client's potentiality to cope with the multiple social difficulties; mobilization and maintenance of the healthy part of his personality; prevention of the development of pathological attitudes—assistance grants must be adequate. Thus, by holding on to certain basic principles we have seen these effects reflected in growing awareness by other community programs of the ways in which social needs must be met. In some in-

stances this has resulted in improvement in standards and procedures of the services of public agencies.

Historically, the sectarian agencies have been pioneers in the field of child care, and we regard as one of our primary responsibilities, direct service to children in their own homes and to those requiring foster care. The evolution of professional social work with its emphasis on individualization of the child, and the development of public programs so that more financial aid was made available to children in their own homes, reoriented our thinking about how children's needs could be met more constructively. We are still learning how to develop and use our skills to meet the need for specialized services to children. This has meant restudying our use of foster homes and learning how we can be more helpful to those families that devote their efforts to the care and training of children. It has also meant that institutions that formerly gave custodial care primarily could rethink their programs and see how they might develop resources to meet the needs of children who would benefit through group care. It has also meant that some facilities were free to develop a new service which was not already provided in the community.

One of the great needs in Connecticut is adequate care for the mentally retarded child of preschool age, for admission to the state training schools is limited to children over six years of age. We know the anxiety and guilt suffered by parents of these children and we are also aware of the difficulty, and many times the inadvisability, of having these children remain in the family. We have observed the value both to the child and to the family where a program of adequate care has been developed as a specialized service under sectarian auspices. The care of such a child is so involved with the parents' emotions—at times even to the extent of imperiling the marriage—that frequently the most constructive approach is on the spiritual level. When funds and available trained personnel permit, we hope that one of our child caring institutions will redirect its program to providing this service.

Some sectarian agencies have had the good fortune to be able to develop, under religious direction, specialized services for the emotionally disturbed child. This requires special facilities, exception-

ally skilled staff, and adequate psychological, psychiatric, and casework services. In my own diocese we did not feel that there would be adequate support from private funds for developing this program and so we are lending our efforts to formulating and directing a program for a study and treatment home under public auspices. Various Jewish agencies have made exceptional progress in this area, and from this source we are deriving a great deal of knowledge in administration and treatment programs. Through our participation in establishing this state-wide service we will avoid future controversies arising from misconceptions of psychiatry and religion.

In the past five years, through the related fields of anthropology and psychology, we have enriched our child care services by the development of our adoption program. This has meant a complete revamping of the program of a maternity home and institution for babies and wider use of foster homes where both parents were trained in infant care. Whereas previously a child was not placed for adoption until he was from six months to a year old, we are now making many placements of infants three or four months old. Within the past year and a half we have been placing directly in adoptive homes, selected infants from three to six weeks of age. We are moving slowly, feeling that we have a great deal to learn even though the program is in the hands of competent caseworkers in consultation with psychiatrists, psychologists, pediatricians, and other specialists.

The program of the maternity home has reflected this development in our adoption procedure, and no longer is the home regarded by an unmarried mother as a place where "she has to stay." In seeking a sectarian agency the unmarried mother is requesting the protection and respect she so sorely needs and confidence that the welfare of her child will be protected. In an environment rich enough to make her experience there both interesting and constructive, the mother is free to seek the consolation and strengths provided in her religious teachings and to discuss her emotional reactions of guilt, frustration, and hostility with the social worker. The freedom she has in participating in the planning for her child makes it possible for her to discuss an early adoption without the

feeling of neglect or a desire to evade responsibility. Psychological and psychiatric services are as much an integral part of this resource as shelter and medical care.

Those who have worked with emigrés and with refugee children know the difficulties of readjustment in a new country. We have seen them suffer from anxieties, fears, even when they are living in comfortable circumstances. Traumatic experiences of loss of home, parents, siblings, and sometimes an entire village population, cannot be satisfied through resettlement, which many times emphasizes a false sense of security, deepens anxieties and feelings of guilt. Even the fact that in our democratic society adjustment springs from the willingness of the individual is decidedly confusing, and it is not surprising that he is apt to be on his guard, easily dissatisfied and discouraged, confused, demanding, and distrustful. His greatest need is for understanding friendship which offers tangible aid, such as housing, a job, relief. His church ties are the one sustaining, balancing factor related to his past which he needs in the new surroundings. In this area sectarian agencies have not only an obligation but a tremendous opportunity. We are meeting the challenge through our work with the Catholic Resettlement Committee and the Catholic Committee for the Care of Refugee Children. This program is not limited to casework, relief, or medical care. The ultimate adjustment and stability of these persons rest in genuine community acceptance of them as friends, relatives, and neighbors. Actually, our casework program, other than with children, plays a very small part in the service to the displaced person. Cultural and nationality opportunities are offered by the parishes in order that from the very beginning the emigré may find in America his own people, of the religious faith which is so dear to him. In our own diocese, casework service to the adult is supplemental to the pastoral responsibility, some of which is accomplished through consultation or through group discussions organized by parish or nationality organizations and direct service to the individual who is in need of specialized treatment.

Our agency assumes responsibility for the placement of Catholic refugee children and makes an evaluation of the homes offered through the various nationality groupings. Practically all the chil-

dren whom we have placed were orphans whose background history was meager. There were symptoms of restlessness, insomnia, headaches, upset stomach, and a desperate, possessive clinging to siblings. Until the children had been provided with an environment in which there was enough objective understanding of these many symptoms, they were not ready to be placed in foster homes. It was a delicate problem of public relations to provide this care for the children and yet not completely frustrate the unselfish interest of many families offering foster homes. Therefore we have been loath to sponsor a general appeal for homes but have built up our resources on a case-by-case basis.

The democratic way of life stresses the family as a unit of society, and educational, civic, and sectarian resources are steadily developing to help the family and the individual in our complicated social and economic society. Under sectarian auspices we see the growth of programs both on a central and a decentralized basis. Many of these lend themselves to leadership within the membership of natural groupings. In the church of which I am a member, informal recreation for youth, adult educational projects, health services, school social service, cooperatives, are frequently organized as parish programs, while the more technically specialized services are usually centralized in a diocesan agency with the use of both types of service for the well-being of the individual. Because of the variety and wealth of such activities individual and family life is enriched.

As a sectarian agency we know that many of these programs can be used as self-help measures and without threat to the individual's feeling of adequacy. I shall mention two such resources widely utilized by our agency. One is mothers' circles within the various church groups. This type of group therapy is used with mothers concerned about child care and training, sex education, and the spiritual development of children in present-day society.

The other resource is the Cana Conference Movement, which emphasizes for dating couples education for marriage and preparation for its serious responsibilities, while for married couples it helps to make marriage a continuing, enriching, spiritual relationship. The Cana Conference is a simplified form of marital counsel-

ing. Opportunity for group discussion of marriage as a spiritual opportunity, a psychological experience, and a physical process, with all its privileges, duties, responsibilities, and problems, is its objective. Marriages that are seriously threatened are referred by the leader to our agency where counseling on marital problems and individual adjustments is handled by the trained caseworker, many times with the assistance of psychiatric, medical, and spiritual consultation.

It is one of our responsibilities not only constantly to examine our own services and to relate them to other constructive programs under clerical and community auspices but to demonstrate the need for additional services which are the responsibilities of other organizations. The effects of this repeated effort are bearing fruit in the psychiatric programs of Catholic hospitals. A few sectarian agencies have the financial means to support these clinical services as a part of the regular program, but through cooperation with other resources this program can be placed in a hospital with psychological, psychiatric, and casework services available to the community. The respect that psychiatry accords the history of the individual and its emphasis on psychic injury reaffirm more than any other discipline the dignity of the human person, while the fact that this service is developed under sectarian auspices has sometimes resulted in ease in referral and confidence in its use by many individuals who are unconverted to the value of psychiatry.

Another need on which we as a casework agency are working is in relation to the parochial schools. At the present time there are no social workers in our parochial schools. It has been recommended that the Diocesan Bureau of Social Service establish this service. Our board questioned this as a function of a family and children's agency but recommended that such a step be taken by the Catholic Board of Education. However, in order to bridge the gap, certain caseworkers are assigned to the work in various parishes. Effort is made to interpret our services and to encourage early discussion of problems if not formal referrals. Hence we look upon this as a two-way service since the more intimately the caseworker becomes acquainted with the program of each particular school the more skillfully will she be able to use this knowledge in the selection of foster

homes for children needing a particular type of educational training.

Since the tremendous need for social services will never be met entirely by the trained worker, the voluntary agency has a growing opportunity and an increasing duty to absorb into constructive planning the great wealth of volunteer service. In order to do this, the agency must first be convinced that a certain part of the program can be carried adequately by trained volunteers and then be willing to devote time and effort to their recruitment, training, and supervision. We have placed our emphasis on the contribution a trained volunteer can make in a service program for the aged. For a while, we were not clear, as a sectarian agency, just how our services could be made available in the expanding governmental program, but now our professional staff works with the public agency on a cooperative basis and with our trained volunteers in meeting many of the needs of elderly persons. It is a challenge to us to mobilize this volunteer effort and to use it skillfully and effectively. The Church has always been the bulwark in fostering the democratic way of life, stressing that the individual is of primary importance, and his life enriched through balanced material, emotional, and spiritual opportunities.

Our program for the aged applies to all aged persons and is not necessarily restricted to those receiving public or private assistance. Much of the work is carried on through the parishes by referral from the pastor and in conjunction with the general community effort and its interest in the aging population. Parish groups are interested in cooperating with other organizations in attempting to meet the recreational needs on a neighborhood basis. Various religious groups under the leadership of a trained group worker have combined efforts in sponsoring neighborhood "Over Sixty" clubs. Specific personal needs of club members are discussed by the group leader with the appropriate private agency, where it is determined whether there is need for the skilled service of the caseworker or whether the problem might be met through the more personal interest of a trained volunteer supervised by the professional worker.

Now the flexibility of these casework programs demand unity, support, and adequate financial assistance. Therefore sectarian

agencies as well as other private agencies put great stress on interpretation and public relations. We have spoken of the wealth of resources within sectarian fields, but these resources must know what the specialized services are doing. If we do not seize every opportunity to make our work known there are two reactions among our own group to the sectarian program. The first is that we do everything, and the second is that the public does not know what we are doing. Both are equally dangerous and equally defeating. It is most essential that every employee from the custodian to the executive be thoroughly informed as to the entire program. We stress that each member of the staff is a representative of the principles and practices of the agency. Therefore, because of the intimate relationship with the personality and character of the social worker, the development of the casework program is thoroughly dependent upon his outlook, his values, his motives, his ideals and ideas. A sectarian agency has an opportunity to aid in the spiritual development of every staff member. My agency each year provides for all Catholic workers a three-day spiritual retreat under the leadership of a spiritual instructor. Time is spent in instruction, prayer, and meditation so that by enrichment of spiritual qualifications we may improve our personal characteristics and be of greater service to those needing assistance in living through the experiences of everyday life in our highly competitive society.

Constructive Aspects of Public Assistance for the Aged

By ELMER V. ANDREWS

AGED RECIPIENTS OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE are among the old soldiers of our society. For one reason or another they have wholly or partially retired from the front-line combatant forces of our economic army. Are we utilizing their valuable wisdom, skill, and economic and social potentialities? Never more than in this uncertain atomic age did our nation need the collective productivity of its total citizenry. We must preserve and utilize every personal value if we are to bring hope to this troubled world and reflect democracy's basic interest in human welfare.

Some people outside social work may quickly say that much of a constructive nature can be achieved through public aid and related services for children and young disabled persons. After all, with a little help and guidance at this crucial period in their lives they can anticipate many years of productive activity. But the aged are another story. They are already in the sunset years and about all that they require is a little financial assistance to keep body and soul together. Those who have interested themselves in the problems of the aging know that this great minority of our total population must not be so superficially shelved. Maybe the possibilities are more limited for the long run, but that should not deter us in our efforts to prevent and alleviate mental and physical suffering with regard to all our people. Under our basic democratic concepts, we strive to preserve dignity, freedom, stability, opportunity, and minimum security for all groups.

At this mid-century, an increasing proportion of our population is found among those aged sixty-five or more. Our national population has about doubled since 1900. In 1900 four out of every 100 Americans were sixty-five or over; today there are nearly eight aged

persons to every 100. We have now around eleven and a half million persons sixty-five and over, and it has been estimated that this group will reach nearly twenty million by 1975. More and more people, including the aged, have shifted from rural areas to cities and towns. Nearly 96 percent of older persons live in households, whereas about 4 percent live in institutions, homes for aged, etc. Of the total aged population, about $78\frac{1}{2}$ percent live in households with related persons, and about $17\frac{1}{3}$ percent live alone or with nonrelatives. In December, 1949, about one third of the aged received earnings; about one fourth received social insurance and related benefits (including old age and survivors insurance to about 17 percent); and about 24 percent were recipients of old age assistance.¹

With this growth in the proportion of older people in our population came an awareness of new pressing problems. The ground swell was felt in various parts of the country as agencies, committees, and individuals began to discuss, plan, and develop programs to meet an evident critical need. Ultimately, this led to the first national Conference on Aging which was held in Washington in August of 1950. More than eight hundred delegates from all parts of the country and representative of religion, social work, labor, business, medicine, education, recreation, housing, and related fields explored the problem, reached conclusions, and made recommendations for action. The successful operation of many projects prior to the Conference, plus the impetus of the Conference itself, has resulted in enthusiasm for the mobilization of resources and the adoption of programs nationwide.

A basic requirement of aged persons is economic security, and this constitutes one of the most difficult problems which our generation faces. Old age assistance is the primary public assistance program for those in the twilight years, even though many aged are aided through general, disability, and blind assistance. At the end of the last fiscal year nearly 2,800,000 individuals received old age assistance with a nationwide average grant of \$44 per month. For that fiscal year the total expenditure amounted to \$1,437,981,000.

Such staggering totals do not of themselves indicate the kind

¹ Statistics from the United States Bureau of Census and the Federal Security Agency.

of constructive public assistance of which we speak. With an aging population, inflation, and an industrial economy maybe we should expect heavy case loads and expenditures until such time as the social insurances and the preventive and rehabilitative services assume the major role and public assistance is reduced to the residual status we have long advocated. However, these case loads and expenditures conclusively show that old age assistance has to a great extent met the challenge of mass minimum security of needy aging people. Although we know that old age assistance programs have gaps that need to be plugged, I think we would agree that stomachs have been fed, backs have been clothed, and medical services have been furnished under our present assistance program in a far more professional and dignified way than prevailed under the colonial and Elizabethan methods. Good public assistance techniques preclude the subjection of needy aged persons to humiliating treatment, arbitrary decisions, and inequitable allowances. We have made great progress in this constructive aspect of public assistance.

Now I would like to discuss a few services which are supplementary to the actual determination of eligibility and the granting of old age assistance. Obviously, we can merely touch a few of the many which have demonstrated their utility beyond question. However, we can be certain that the success of various projects to date will have far-reaching significance in the years just ahead.

Medical authorities have advised that aging persons should work as long as they can and that there is no psychological or physiological basis for arbitrary retirement at any given age. We are reminded of Gladstone, Justice Holmes, Baruch, Toscanini, Langmuir, and Grandma Moses. These are but examples of older persons whose genius and contributions would have been lost if they had retired to the rocking chair on the back porch at sixty-five. Most healthy and able old age assistance recipients prefer to be wholly or partially self-supporting. There is now a greater awareness of the value of the maturity, dependability, and productivity of our aging population and, in light of the tremendous defense mobilization which we now face, we have a great opportunity to demonstrate the usefulness of older people and at the same time to reduce dependency.

In New Jersey, as in other states, public assistance and employment service officials have developed plans aimed at assisting recipients to secure employment. The employment officials have provided us with information as to employment trends, where and what kinds of jobs are available, procedures to be followed in getting employment. Our public assistance officials on the state level have in turn provided information to the local administering assistance officials. At the same time, the state employment offices have provided their local representatives with necessary advice regarding the cooperative effort. Furthermore, helpful related data from both state offices will be released to local offices as it becomes available, and joint conferences on both state and local levels are planned to keep in touch with developments and changing circumstances. Through this means our social workers will be able to give helpful and fruitful counseling and guidance to many able and qualified recipients who are anxious to be self-reliant and productively active.

Great strides have been made in geriatrics and the study of chronic diseases, and further intensive research in these areas of medical science holds great promise for our society. Old age assistance programs provide funds in one way or another to cover many medical requirements of recipients, and it has been said that this portion of our aging population gets more and better medical care on the average than some middle- and low-income self-supporting younger groups. However, it appears that the expenditures are primarily for acute conditions and advanced chronic sickness rather than for preventive services. In saying this I am mindful of some diagnostic and treatment programs which are intended to detect and correct in an early stage a disease which, if not arrested, would be more costly ultimately. Maybe this is a practice that should be given further consideration and more general application. It is to be expected that the incidence of chronic disease, with its agonizing disability, will be much greater in older groups than with young people. As you know, there is a National Commission on Chronic Illness, and there are similar organizations in many states and cities. Their purposes are to study the problem and to stimulate cooperative planning by agencies and

individuals whereby chronic diseases will be eliminated or detected in time to take preventive measures. The problem of dealing with chronic disease is too sweeping to be undertaken by a single agency, but public assistance workers can cooperate fully in providing factual data to these specialized organizations and can incorporate in our policies and standards the scientific knowledge that becomes available and thereby prevent chronic disability or effectively rehabilitate or alleviate suffering in cases where it is too late for prevention.

What are we doing about mental health to prevent morbidity and to cultivate wholesome personalities? Our social workers in their regular contacts can help recipients grow old gracefully, accept and understand physical limitations, participate in activities and hobbies which interest them, and also help relatives and friends to understand the necessity of avoiding words or actions that may be interpreted by an elderly person to mean that they are a burden to those they love. In addition to overworked, friendly, and understanding social workers, there is need for specialist teams to give professional consultation to the public assistance caseworkers and also to provide counsel to aging people who are troubled and in need of competent professional advice. In New Jersey all state institutions and agencies pertaining to correction, mental health, and welfare are administered through one department. A few months ago, this department advocated a comprehensive, state-wide mental health program, including services for the aging. The welfare staff cooperated in providing data and consultation to the departmental mental health officials with regard to problems of the aging. Among the recommendations was one providing for the establishment of team services to aging persons and including such personnel as a physician, psychiatrist, psychologist, social worker, visiting nurse, rehabilitationist, and clergyman. The report also encouraged the organization of volunteers as foster relatives and friends for aged persons having a scarcity of relatives and friends of their own.

New Jersey, like many other states, because of the lack of facilities in its various communities, has in its state hospitals many senile persons who are not actually in need of institutional placement.

The welfare and mental health officials of the Department of Institutions and Agencies have discussed the problem and have developed preliminary plans whereby, through cooperative effort, it is hoped that additional homes will be found in various communities for eligible persons. Upon their discharge from the hospitals old age assistance will be granted to these old people. Consultation by hospital staff will be available to the assistance workers and clients as needed to serve this particular group of the aged. This type of family care will provide satisfying opportunities which large institutions cannot furnish and at the same time will open up facilities, already overcrowded, to persons who badly need institutional services.

There is a great inadequacy of good nursing and boarding home facilities. This appears to be an area in which our assistance agencies face a tremendous job, as partners with the licensing staff, in encouraging the development of such facilities. In New Jersey the licensing of hospitals and nursing homes is a responsibility of our department, and there are frequent conferences between the assistance staff and the nursing home staff. It seems to me that this teamlike arrangement indirectly constitutes a service to the aging as it relates to essential standards pertaining to balanced diets, satisfactory fire protection, and reasonable management and medical records. One of the major problems is that of funds. Unless public assistance allowances are adequate to encourage the opening of new private homes, the serious shortage may continue. Although allowances have been substantially increased in recent years, many operators still contend that more must be paid even though the reasonable certainty of payment in old age assistance is acknowledged. Certain provisions of federal P.L. 734 may lead to the establishment of some additional public facilities for nursing care. Many old age assistance recipients will wish to use such institutions, and public assistance representatives can perform a constructive service to the aged by active participation in the development of sound standards governing such projects.

Public assistance, to be constructive, must be available to all needy people and must be sufficient to provide allowances compatible with decency and health. The states use a variety of methods

for determining quality and quantity of necessities and the cost of same. New Jersey employs a full-time home economics consultant who, with the cooperation of advisory committees, determines requirements and monetary allowances. Semiannual state-wide pricings are made; if these reveal a fluctuation of 5 percent or more either way, new allowance schedules are released and grants are adjusted. Our consultant also prepares a chatty, friendly, and informative monthly newsletter which is mailed with assistance checks to all recipients of aid to dependent children. In light of the very favorable response, we hope to extend this service to old age assistance recipients. The letter gives practical suggestions regarding tasty recipes that can be prepared within assistance budgets; hints as to seasonal trends in low-cost nutritious foods; similar helpful information on clothing and heating; and neighborly advice regarding the importance of social activity and mental health. She also provides consultation to nursing homes, homes for the aged, and individual recipients, upon request. We hope to arrange staff meetings of workers who serve the aged and to have this consultant, together with other specialists, conduct training programs pertaining to personal and family problems and interests.

Obviously, I have referred to only a few constructive aspects of public assistance to our aging population. It would take a book, and a thick one, merely to survey the problem and to outline what has been accomplished and what is being planned by various public welfare and voluntary agencies: (1) home care of the ill and homemaker services; (2) rehabilitation programs; (3) housing and shared matching facilities; (4) successful social, creative, and recreational activities; (5) adult education; (6) counseling; (7) joint public and private planning; and (8) church and voluntary agency referrals of public assistance clients.

Taxes are burdensome and additional funds for related services are not readily available. Until case loads decline, workers are not going to be able to devote as much time to individual casework as is admittedly desirable, even though the preventive and rehabilitative gains should in the long run prove economically desirable. However, we can demonstrate our creativeness through step-by-step achievements and look forward to greater accomplishments in

social services as insurance, employment, prevention, and rehabilitation programs lead to a diminution of time devoted to the urgent job of income maintenance. If a little more staff were immediately available, the trend and its resultant savings of human and material resources would be greatly expedited.

The Public Agency Looks at Its Rehabilitation Program

By MARY E. SWITZER

IT IS NOT WITHOUT SIGNIFICANCE that the vocational rehabilitation program is one of the earliest of the programs of service to our people undertaken as a joint federal-state responsibility. Developed as a part of the vocational education program made necessary by the technical demands of our industrial mobilization as dramatized by the First World War, the first vocational rehabilitation act was adopted in 1920. The law provided for federal grants-in-aid to state boards of vocational education, and until 1935 the total annual expenditure never exceeded \$2,250,000. During this first period only some seventy-seven thousand persons were rehabilitated.

The program was highly selective. Almost nothing was known about physical rehabilitation as we know it today. The striking cases of victory over extreme handicaps were largely due to the individuals' own will power and strength in overcoming great odds. Training, however, was provided in a great variety of trades and professions. The administration of the program was in the hands of people whose experience had been in the field of vocational education. Community organization for rehabilitation was virtually unknown. The role of the federal government was relatively minor in that the staff was small and unable to provide any technical or consultative services except in the course of general responsibility for administering the grants-in-aid. During this period, too, the depression made it difficult to insure job placement and, though the need was mounting through disease and accidents, medical knowledge was slow to keep pace and employment opportunities were at a premium.

It was natural, therefore, that when the Social Security Act was

under consideration in the thirties, rehabilitation should be considered as part of the rounded concept of health and welfare services which that Act covered. Although the authority for the program was made permanent in the Social Security Act and the annual federal appropriation somewhat increased and permanently authorized, the number of people served did not increase materially.

Training was still "around the disability," and only a very superficial approach was made to any aspect of physical medicine and rehabilitation. Artificial appliances were provided, and a few rehabilitation centers were being developed under voluntary auspices to point the way to a more comprehensive conception of what physical rehabilitation could mean. Employment opportunities were still limited; even though the United States Employment Service through its nationwide system of employment offices was beginning to help find openings. Within recent years, the activities of the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week have been directed toward overcoming employer prejudice toward employment of qualified handicapped persons.

However, the Social Security Act and the services provided to meet the depression needs put the public agencies deeply into the health and welfare business. Services for crippled children were being developed all over the country. The public health programs were high-lighting certain diseases that were being attacked aggressively. Vocational rehabilitation agencies were becoming increasingly aware of the vast unmet need among our physically handicapped citizens and particularly of the urgent pressure for more comprehensive services of physical medicine and rehabilitation. During this period too the National Health Survey had brought home the fact that a vast number of our people had some disability needing attention. It was estimated, at this time, that twenty-three million Americans had some physical handicap.

In 1939 the Federal Security Agency was created, bringing under one administrator all our major federal programs in health, education, and welfare. During 1939 and 1940, too, the defense program was making demands on our manpower which resulted in

gradually changing the complexion of the labor market which had for ten years been dominated by the need to open up employment for ten or twelve million unemployed men and women. The Second World War further emphasized the need for comprehensive rehabilitation services, and in 1943 the Barden-La Follette Act was passed. This legislation forms the basis of our program today. The most significant changes were in the financial structure, in the definite mandate for physical rehabilitation, in recognizing the mentally ill as a proper group to serve, and in authorizing rehabilitation services for the blind.

Under the Barden-La Follette amendments, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation was established, and the federal government undertook to match all casework funds of the states and, in addition, to pay all costs of administration and of guidance and placement. In 1950 \$30,000,000 was spent: \$20,000,000 federal and \$10,000,000 state.

Through this federal-state program these essential services of vocational rehabilitation in necessary combinations were provided to handicapped persons: (1) medical and vocational diagnosis to determine their potential; (2) counsel and guidance in their struggle; (3) physical restoration services of all kinds to remove or reduce the disability; (4) training and conditioning to prepare them for competitive life; (5) maintenance and transportation; (6) tools, licenses, and necessary supplies; (7) placement in suitable employment; and (8) follow-up adjustment services to enhance the prospects of continued success in their work.

At any one time we now may find as many as 300,000 men and women on the rolls in the state agencies. Generally we find about 100,000 receiving services designed to return—or for the first time to bring—the disabled to the fullest possible realization of their physical, mental, social, and economic potentialities. In 1950, for the third consecutive year, a new peak of successful rehabilitation was attained: about 60,000 disabled persons between the ages of sixteen and sixty-five were enabled to take up or resume nearly normal activity. The large majority of these people are now engaging successfully in self-sustaining employment. Others have been restored to their work as housewives or family workers.

Obviously, rehabilitation requires a battery of services, public and private. The public phase is one of many partners—eighty-seven state, territorial, and insular agencies cooperating under the aegis of the federal government as represented by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Federal Security Agency. Very few actual services except counseling, guidance, and selective placement are provided by the public rehabilitation agencies; rather the needed services are arranged for and paid for by the public agencies after diagnosis has been accomplished.

One cannot think of public programs in rehabilitation without mentioning the important place of the Military Establishments and the Veterans Administration (VA). With the exception of one or two voluntary rehabilitation centers, the best of our specialized programs exist in these institutions. In the hospitals of the Military Establishment are found the fruits of the dynamic programs of physical medicine and rehabilitation developed in the Second World War under the leadership particularly of Dr. Howard Rusk. For example, one of the best amputee centers in the country, complete with all phases of limb manufacturing and prosthetic device adjustment, is to be found at the Oak Knoll Naval Hospital on the West Coast. At Walter Reed Hospital in Washington, D.C., we have significant work going on with the deaf and hard of hearing, perhaps more comprehensive than at any other one center. In the VA we have paraplegic centers in the Bronx (N.Y.), at Hines (Ill.), Long Beach (Calif.), Framingham (Mass.), Richmond (Va.), and Memphis (Tenn.), and also work with the blind at Hines General Hospital in Chicago. All these special rehabilitation services are available to all the injured members of our military forces while they are on active duty and subsequently in the Veterans Administration until they are restored as nearly to full capacity as possible.

It is significant too in thinking of the total civilian load which agencies like ours should be serving that nonservice-connected cases of severely disabled veterans far outnumber service-connected cases and do not receive in the VA hospitals the same comprehensive kind of program as do the service-connected cases. One of the important groups which our state divisions of vocational rehabilitation are now attempting to serve is the group of nonservice-

connected paraplegic veterans. The Military Establishment and the VA have contributed significantly to research and training opportunities in the rehabilitation field.

More and more we think of the rehabilitation center as a focal point of all that is needed in physical medicine and rehabilitation. Outside the centers connected with the military and VA hospitals most of the outstanding ones where these comprehensive services are provided today are under voluntary auspices. There is one notable exception. The Woodrow Wilson Rehabilitation Center at Fishersville, Virginia, is the one example of a center planned, developed, and financed jointly by the federal government and the state of Virginia. This was accomplished under the Barden-La Follette Act and has been operating since July, 1947. The center has a capacity to service 400 patients for physical and psychological rehabilitation and has vocational training in a dozen trades. It serves patients from thirteen states.

It would be difficult to estimate the number of such centers that should be established ultimately. Much would depend, of course, on the simultaneous growth of voluntary centers, and there is considerable evidence that this growth is real. Unquestionably, however, one of the most urgent needs in our public program is the development of a cooperative plan, state by state, on a national scale which would lay out the number and kind of rehabilitation centers necessary to meet our total needs.

We are particularly encouraged by the program which a number of state rehabilitation agencies are developing in extending services to the more severely disabled. Interesting examples are:

1. *The program for epileptics in Illinois.*—Four out of five (instead of the national average of one out of five) are being treated and trained to become employable.

2. *The program to empty beds of the chronically ill at Gallinger Hospital, Washington, D.C.*—Vigorous application of the techniques of rehabilitation, supervised by a skilled psychiatrist, have already produced striking results. Within the first six months the average stay of orthopedic patients has been reduced 50 percent, yielding a savings of \$51,000 to Gallinger Hospital.

3. *The special project of the Virginia rehabilitation agency.*—

In cooperation with the physical medicine department of VA McGuire Hospital at Richmond, a complete program of vocational rehabilitation services to nonservice-connected paraplegic veterans has been provided. Ten paraplegics have already left the hospital to take specific training for employment.

4. *Specific focus on the rehabilitation of the alcoholic.*—Colorado and California, two states which have pioneered in this field, have found their best success when the individual is willing to accept completely the program and principles of Alcoholics Anonymous supplemented by the appropriate services which the state agency can provide.

5. *Working with the mentally ill.*—Depending primarily upon the availability of facilities, staff, and simple factors, all states are working with the mentally ill. Of particular significance is what can be done in a state such as Montana where there are vast distances, small population, and modest facilities. Through close cooperation with the state hospital at Warm Springs, a sizable group of patients have been returned to the community as useful, self-supporting citizens. During a four-year period, 155 patients were placed in 35 different trades and professions; at the end of this period, 121 were still employed and earning an average weekly wage of \$30.87. The taxpayers of Montana have saved thousands of dollars, but more important, life has begun again for these individuals.

Programs for the blind usually operating under state commissions for the blind but often under the general program now have eleven adjustment centers. These are an important service to blind clients of our state agencies but are just a small number compared to the total needed.

In several states the beginnings of cooperative work in the field of chronic illness are visible, especially in relation to heart disease. Here the heart program of the United States Public Health Service, the local health agencies, and voluntary groups like the American Heart Association and local affiliates are working together. Increasingly, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, federally, and the state and local health departments, locally, will be pooling resources for rehabilitation.

While the public program of vocational rehabilitation is re-

stricted now by law to serving those of working age, we are continuously aware that the exceptional child of today is the handicapped adult of tomorrow. Our agencies work closely with the programs for children, and we must work even more closely. We strive for continuity of service for the child whose early help must come from the programs for crippled children—both public and privately sponsored programs. We work too within the schools to try to insure continuing programs of training for the children who require special educational and psychological services.

Relationships with the school system also includes making full use of the public vocational training facilities in preparing handicapped persons for employment. In cooperation with the Office of Education, we have released a guide for vocational school instructors on how to teach blind persons to operate machines and use hand tools.

Rehabilitation agencies are becoming increasingly aware of the value of the techniques associated with social casework in accomplishing rehabilitation. This is particularly true, I think, in the hospital setting. If we think of rehabilitation not as the process of mending after the accident or injury but rather as a philosophy in the practice of medicine we will see that rehabilitation techniques applied early to hospitalized individuals will often go a long way to prevent invalidity. Many of our general hospitals have departments of physical medicine and rehabilitation. Many of the patients, particularly in the publicly operated hospitals, would benefit very much from early contact with a vocational rehabilitation counselor. In a number of communities excellent cooperation has been established between the hospitals and the rehabilitation agencies, but a surprisingly small percentage of referrals to the local rehabilitation office come from hospitals. In 1950, I believe, it was only 11 percent.

It is absolutely imperative that we concentrate on stressing the importance of early rehabilitation treatment. No group could help as effectively as social workers in this area. Who should have a better knowledge of community-wide facilities and opportunities and who could better prepare a patient to accept rehabilitation counseling? We expect to put special emphasis on this type of coopera-

tive effort in the immediate future and we shall count heavily on social workers for understanding support. This is the great area for a preventive program and for tackling the job in its early stage before set patterns, psychologically as well as physically, make the ultimate job twice as difficult.

The federal staff gives a limited amount of professional and technical consultative services to state agencies by direct contact, by conducting institutes and workshops. The federal office, of course, has responsibility for over-all financing, for program planning on a national scale, and for being a national informational and educational agency in this whole field. It develops cooperative agreements nationally with government agencies and national voluntary organizations having a stake in rehabilitation.

What further support can such public programs provide? Our real bottleneck is lack of trained personnel. It will be impossible to meet stepped-up defense demands without a dynamic training program. Traditionally, the federal government has always taken responsibility for training in areas of special emphasis. The Public Health Service did this in its cancer, heart, and mental health programs as well as in many others. We need today as a first priority an aggressive training program which would make available all types of workers—doctors in physical medicine, physical therapists, social workers, psychiatrists, psychologists, counselors, and special placement officers to work as teams or to compose teams to do the community job of evaluation and rehabilitation that must be accomplished. Then we need facilities—comprehensive rehabilitation centers strategically located, adjustment centers for the blind, curative workshops, special wings for physical medicine and rehabilitation in our hospitals. In all these areas the federal government should be a partner with the state government, and possibly with voluntary agencies much on the order of the hospital survey construction program. We need the most aggressive development of sheltered workshops, not only to help the severely disabled to become competent in the regular labor market, but also to give them experience and training in work tolerance before full employment. And finally, the government should assume responsibility for comprehensive research programs especially accommodated to the dy-

namic needs of present-day rehabilitation. Much is being learned from the studies of the chronic illnesses carried on by the Public Health Service in its many institutes. But much more needs to be done.

Let us look at this program against the backdrop of our present needs. Charles E. Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization, translates our manpower needs into simple terms that cannot be misunderstood. Three to four million more workers, he estimates, must be added to our labor force before 1951 ends. If we are to achieve our goals, we must concentrate on building up our forces of production right now—today. There is no time to lose.

We have no backlog of unemployed workers as we did at the outbreak of the Second World War. To add to the labor market we must tap new sources: women, the older worker, the handicapped. Of these, the handicapped make up the most stable available supply and offer the most certain group of potential workers. There is a pool of 2,000,000 to draw upon. To make it possible for these people to be fully effective in our present mobilization is the challenge to our public programs of vocational rehabilitation. To accomplish our purpose, present work and service must be intensified and most of our dreams made realities promptly.

In accomplishing this mission all of us in the public and private programs alike can take unusual satisfaction in our work which, although being carried on under ominous clouds of strife, is the foundation for rebuilding and hope.

What Can Casework Say to the Public in These Times?

By EVA BURMEISTER

THIS STATEMENT WAS PREPARED by seven people in the typical city of Milwaukee: a newspaper reporter who covers the welfare beat; a program director of a radio station which helps agencies interpret their work; a public relations worker on the staff of the Community Welfare Council; the public relations worker of a family service agency; an agency board member who also serves on the Community Welfare Council Social Planning Committee; the director of a large public welfare agency; and the director of a small institution for children. The comments of this committee were then sent to a number of national consultants, several of them in the public relations field. Some of their reactions and additional thoughts are included in the paper written by Eva Burmeister.

THE COMMITTEE HAD TROUBLE at first in holding the car to the road. There was, right at the start, a wide detour from which there was no turning back. There was a great ventilation of feeling on the old subject of all that is wrong about what social workers have said and how they said it. The newspaper reporter said that the newspaper, in general, thought that social workers always withheld more information than they gave out, that they had much to learn on what was newsworthy and what was timely. The board member complained that workers isolated themselves professionally and socially, and why did they always use that language—that lingo that only they themselves understood? The public relations workers questioned why caseworkers treated their clients with great skill and care, and yet failed to apply their capacity for establishing good relationship when it came to working or talking with people who are not clients. When the caseworker meets a new client, she first finds where the client is, in his thinking and feeling, and starts from there. But if she is talking to a new board member, for example, the caseworker quickly becomes impatient if he cannot clip along at the caseworker's professional tempo. "We aren't kid-

ding people," one of our public relations members said. "They sense it, and something about us is disturbing to them." In her discussion with a lay person or a worker in another profession, the caseworker is hesitant, she does not give an honest, straightforward answer, and she more or less evaluates the other person as if to question how much it is safe to tell him.

One committee member said that the workers on his staff had case loads of at least thirty families, all of them heavily loaded with dramatic content. Yet a worker often could not think of a thing that would make a good case story for him to use. The radio program director thought we underplayed the emotional content of social work instead of making use of emotional situations to help in our interpretive work. Some caseworkers object to the use of the term "emotional appeal" on the basis that the emotions aroused are those of pity. We do not mean "pity" specifically but we feel that the term might include sympathy, a desire to help, greater understanding, aroused interest, insight, and imagining oneself in the other fellow's shoes. Other criticisms were that social workers have accumulated so much knowledge and have left the public far behind. There have been great changes and swings in practice; these confuse people and breed lack of confidence. "On the other hand," said a member of the committee, "let's face up to what we are and what we can do, and not try ourselves to be, or be cajoled by others into being, more than is appropriate to our knowledge and helping ability. We are not M.D.'s, we are not statesmen, we are not glamour folks, easily sold to the public on our good looks and entertainment skills."

We asked the public relations worker if these things had not been said often before, and couldn't we just skip them? She said no, criticisms like these are made in public relations meetings and workshops, but caseworkers do not say them to one another. Nor do they have access to meetings where critical comments in connection with caseworkers are brought out and discussed. And so we had better clear the decks first. Thus, we want to say at the start that we do recognize that we have limitations as we try to put ourselves and our story across. But like the client who has some insight into his problems and who takes the next step and asks for help in

working them out, there is hope for us. We are responding to treatment. "And," says Edith Lauer, of the Child Welfare League, "interpret we must, interpret we do, in one way or another, positively or negatively, every hour of the day, whether we carry case loads, supervise, or administer the whole agency."

At this point the committee went back to the main problem: What can we say in times like these? We can, and should, tell many more stories such as *Life* magazine told in its issue of February 19, 1951. The story was that of Linda Joy, told in pictures and brief narrative in collaboration with the Children's Home Society of California. Or the *New Yorker* feature of January 20, 1951, called "The Lonely Time," written by a reporter, Katherine Kincaid, about work with unmarried mothers, and specifically the work of the Youth Consultation Service of New York. There was excellent reporting of good principles and good practice and the story was told in a way that held one's attention. Then there is the series of articles and pictures in *Better Homes and Gardens*, called "What's Wrong with This Family?"—a way of dramatizing normal family problems. The interpretive material was prepared by the Family Service Association of America. On the radio, the "Marriage for the Millions" features were also developed by the Family Service Association. By way of a movie came the outstandingly effective *The Quiet One*, prepared by the staff of Wiltwyck School for Boys, in New York State. All these pieces of interpretation carry a significant message. They make an honest emotional appeal, they cause the reader or watcher to think, and lead him to discuss the content with family and friends. Interpretation of the quality goes a long way toward explaining what the caseworker does and what the agency does. We need to put out so much more of this kind of material in order to reach many more people. The Community Welfare Council public relations member of our committee, whose job is to prepare case material for newspaper, radio, and television, and for a yearly casebook used during the Chest campaign, made this suggestion: "I often ask workers," she said, "to tell me the kind of things they go home and tell their families, in connection with their work." If their families are interested, then the people who read the newspapers are interested, too.

Do the plumber, the carpenter, the auto salesman, the grocer, know what a caseworker is? Do they know what casework is? We might write definitions from now until doomsday, and not many people would be much wiser. But the thousands who, in *Life*, followed the caseworker in the various steps that took baby Linda Joy from the arms of her real mother in a maternity home to the arms of her new foster parents—these thousands of readers could see very clearly what the caseworker does. There is an abundance of dramatic material in every situation with which we deal. Too often we put most of it into the deep freeze of case records, and there it stays. We must be much more willing to share our experiences. We all believe that our agency offers a reliable helpful service; this we must tell, and tell convincingly.

The news reporter on our committee thought it was important for agencies to face up to criticism and controversy, using such occasions, too, to tell their story. We should not wait until a problem breaks but get the matter to the public while it is building up, to show that we are aware of it and are trying to meet it. The newspaper would like to see a general acceptance of the public as a friend, with a right to know what is going on, and not always as a potential critic.

Another pertinent question is: How necessary is casework service in times like these, when there are such pressing needs on the part of large agencies such as the Red Cross, and all the defense preparations? In answer, we must make known the demands for increased services such as day care because mothers are going into industry in greater numbers; and casework is a vital part of day care. The tensions of wartime increase family strains, causing additional drains on the family agencies. Perhaps we should not even say "in times like these." Whether it is 1943 or 1951, the unmarried mother must have someone to help her and some place to go. Parents keep on having families, and childless couples continue to apply to adopt children. The factors which result in the breakdown of families and the necessity for foster care facilities are always present, and child placement goes on year in and year out.

Many businessmen work hard on fund-raising drives. They are accustomed to measuring production in quantity of output and

they would like figures as to our percentage of success or failure. Casework cannot produce startling results on quantity, and often we have an intangible answer when questioned as to the percentage of success. The tempo of our work must of necessity be slow, and the results are not too easy to measure. Family problems are a long time developing, and they cannot be solved in two easy sessions.

Research can give us some definite answers as to results, and we need to do a good deal of interpretation toward getting more research and in connection with research findings. The part of the job that has to do with the manipulation of the environment, as, for example, placing a baby for adoption, is more easily interpreted than what happens in the treatment relationship process, in the office of the caseworker. How many of our supporters would question the cost, in terms of the rate per hour, of a worker who spends an hour, twice a week, with a seven-year-old child, when the production apparently is nothing more than a few messy paintings or a lump of clay that no one can make out *what* it is? We have not done nearly enough, in telling of the relationship between those messy paintings and hunks of clay and this child's improving adjustment. It is a time-consuming, patient process by which the caseworker helps the youngster understand his placement. The process cannot be speeded up to a big-time production basis. Then there are the extended interview cases such as often come to a family agency. The worker gives the client plenty of time to talk out his feelings; then, with skill, the worker uses what she has been told to help the client get some insight concerning what it is that is troubling him. As a result, the client may become able to handle his interpersonal relationships in a more constructive way. To the casual observer not much may appear to be happening, but a great deal happens actually. Much of what happens is preventive of what might have developed into a costly breakdown of the head of a family, the mother of a family, an adolescent, or a young child.

Many family breakups are prevented, and many tensions are relieved. To the caseworkers themselves this may seem like a steady, unexciting volume of work which goes on year after year. However, when told to the lay person, the case story skillfully presented is often an eye opener of some sort. As the world of casework treat-

ment is revealed, of helping people to a better adjustment, the lay listener is sometimes held spellbound when we share with him what we do. He is surprised that he never knew before that such services existed in his community.

As she read over this statement, Edith Lauer added this thought:

Board members surely represent the highest echelon when it comes to responsibility for interpretation, and this is where our role is of primary importance as we set about informing them and gaining the full strength of their special knowledge and special prestige in the community. We must learn better how to capture their enthusiasm and interest. We must learn better how to secure board members who can—and will—exert leadership with the wide range of our “publics”—readers, radio listeners, and viewers.

The use of the case story in interpretation is good, and an honest appeal to the emotions is fine. But too often we find that the case story is a “quickie,” filled with sentiment that is sometimes gooey and coated with a thick frosting of success. To all our desks come agency reports which may do more harm than good in that they oversimplify our work. An individual is pictured in great need. The agency takes over, and presto, the problems are solved. The child is placed in a lovely foster home, the old person is entered into a golden age club, and the family is by some magic straightened out. We have not told enough of the process, the struggle, the failures, or just mild successes. Too often we give the impression that “they lived happily ever after,” that every case succeeded. People get resentful of this professional perfection. Caseworkers would seem more human if they gave the impression that they failed sometimes, that this is hard work, and explained why skilled people are needed to do the work.

We cannot do a mass job, such as the mass education approach toward prevention of tuberculosis or cancer, for example, but the quiet, modest, thorough, case-by-case jobs that are being done in thousands of social agency offices throughout the country have a cumulative effect about which we have said too little. The director of the large public agency told of a project of his agency, and he told it almost as an aside, for it is such a small part of a very large program. Three workers have been assigned to find work for so-

called "unemployable" men. The caseworker might be turned down by fourteen employment managers, but be able to place his man at the fifteenth try. This time-consuming process was slowly but steadily finding much needed manpower for industry; it was taking family after family from the relief load; and it was giving man after man the self-esteem which comes from having a job. We do not hear enough of hundreds of modest projects like this which really make a dent in the total welfare of large numbers of people. Sallie Bright suggests the radiating effects of casework. For example, when casework helps one man, his wife, if he has one, is affected. His relatives may be saved from the unhappiness he might cause them; his employer gets a better worker. If the man's difficulty was affecting his child's adjustment, then, after his treatment, the child's teacher has less of a problem. Another radiation that Mrs. Bright mentions is family life education by which the casework agency takes out to the broader public the knowledge it has gained from working with a limited clientele.

The committee decided that we would not discuss the various media available in our interpretive work. We did want to mention, however, that we in casework should make much more of an effort to familiarize ourselves with the techniques of the media which we use. The reporter suggested that she welcomed the opportunity to become acquainted with staff members of agencies, so that she would be more than just a voice on the phone to them, and they to her.

In Milwaukee in the fall of 1950, immediately preceding and during the Chest campaign, we tried a series of "Come and See" tours. There was hesitancy on the part of some casework agencies which felt that they could not really show their service to a tour of thirty people who stayed half an hour, when there was not much to show but offices. Nor were there specially trained workers skilled in this particular kind of interpretation. But the challenge was accepted, and 2,000 people visited the agencies. Some of the factors which contributed to the success of these tours were these: A family agency representative said that the selection of staff personnel to conduct the tour was all-important. In addition to absorbing her words of explanation, the group sensed the worker's feeling for

people. People picked up the part of the personality of the tour leaders that makes them effective in dealing successfully with the clients of the agency. The factual material about the agency was given in an informal way without technical terminology, but still the leader did not talk down. An attempt was made to give an understanding of the service in terms of the kind of problems brought to the agency. Cases were briefly described. The worker talked of the mother or the father, or the grandmother, not of Mr. or Mrs. Jones. While no technical terminology was used in the presentation, she found that during the question period, when the tour members initiated further discussion, they did at times become quite technical.

Many people expressed a desire to visit a children's institution—there is great curiosity about orphanages—and of course any work with children often has a special appeal. The director of one institution felt that it was necessary to protect the children from being gazed upon by groups of visitors, so the tours were arranged when the youngsters were in school. This children's home had just moved into new cottages, freshly painted, with gleaming kitchens, fresh curtains, and everything spanking new. That fall, the institution did not look needy. So, as the basis for the talk which was given, a clay figure was used, which had been modeled by one of the children, a girl who had been abandoned by both parents when she was little. Over and over, this child made clay figures of a little girl on the knees of a mother or father, a little girl being loved and cherished and protected. But one always saw in the child an unfulfilled yearning as she clung to the mother, because it was the mother whom she never had. Very quickly the kindly folks in the tour groups felt that these figures conveyed and what the tour leader was saying: that while we could house our children in comfortable, colorful surroundings, while they could be well fed and clothed, we could not give what every child wants and needs more than anything else—a father and mother of his very own, who love and want him. We can meet their physical needs better than we can meet their emotional needs. The 2,000 people who went on tours told others what they had seen and heard and learned. The tours are

continuing on a year-round basis on a small scale, and they are showing and telling Mr. and Mrs. Milwaukee more about the services that they are supporting.

One more point—a book has still to be written, a book that will tell about a caseworker and casework in a form that will be read by thousands. Such a book could do for casework what Donald Wilson has done for psychology in *My Six Convicts*.¹ Dr. Wilson's narrative leaves one with a warm feeling toward the psychologist as an awfully nice person; it gives the reader a vivid picture of what goes on, good and bad, behind the walls of one prison, and what goes on in the minds and emotions of the men inside those high walls. Already *My Six Convicts* has been sold to the movies, condensed in *Life*, and selected by a book club. We need a book and a movie that will picture the caseworker as warmly and positively as the psychiatrist in Mary Jane Ward's *The Snake Pit*. There has been a "glock" of doctor books, and books about teaching. Arthur Train has popularized the lawyer, and Henry Morton Robinson, the priest, in *The Cardinal*. Psychiatry has been put into readable form by many such books as Dr. Flanders Dunbar's *Mind and Body* and Dr. William C. Menninger's *You and Psychiatry*. Who is going to write the best seller that will do for casework what these books do for the other professions? Perhaps one of our clients will have to do it, as the patient did in *Wasteland*.²

In this connection, Don Stewart, of Community Chests and Councils, New York, says:

I see no possibility of great increase in budget for public relations activities in casework agencies on the local level, and therefore feel that the turning point in public understanding of what casework will be will rest on efforts made by the Family Service Association of America, the National Publicity Council, and Community Chests and Councils of America, to interest top opinion leaders who can sway mass opinion through articles in national media, novels, and motion pictures.

Today in 1951 when all national effort is striving to preserve a society of individuals, we are concerned with *the* individual. One

¹ Donald Powell Wilson, *My Six Convicts* (New York: Rinehart, 1951).

² Jo Sinclair, *Wasteland* (New York: Harper, 1946).

of our great strengths in times like these is our tenacious retention of the principle of the individual's worth in a climate of mobilization that strains to a breaking point the preservation of the traditional America safeguard of individual rights. As we concentrate on the preservation of the total society, casework can stand as a method of helping individuals and respecting their needs.

Fees for Social Welfare Services

By ALICE T. DASHIELL

THE PROBLEMS OF ADMINISTERING a fee service in a social agency are fewer when the purpose of charging fees is clear. The major objectives in charging fees for service, as this writer sees them, are:

1. A positive factor in the client's use of the agency's service
2. A means of making more available the agency's service to individuals who may be reluctant to use the service if it is free and therefore associated in their minds with charity for inadequate or indigent people
3. A source of income to the private agency, which depends upon community chests and other private contributions for support
4. A step toward establishing professional social casework and the ultimate self-support of its social agency structure upon a sounder economic base

The administration of a social agency responsible for charging fees for service rendered, must carry, first of all, a continuing responsibility for interpretation of the change of policy from a free service to one in which the client participates in meeting costs. This interpretation must reach and be understood by the community from which the social agency has its setting and its right to operate. There is little difference between this responsibility, carried by the administration, and that which is inherent in the agency's relationship to its community, with respect to its total service. Any agency may be seen as springing from community need and receiving financial support from the community, whether it be a private agency or a public, tax-supported agency. All agencies are dependent upon the wish of the community that they operate to meet, if not wholly to solve, the problems of community need for services. Each agency in order to render effective services must be clear about its purpose and function and the standards and policies by which it operates. The agency, composed of board of directors

and staff, is responsible to the community, which is composed of board members, other agencies and organizations, professional and lay groups, individuals, and its clients.

This is not to indicate that any and all community groups and individuals may dictate purpose, function, and standards of practice by the agency. Such definitions and policies are of professional concern and must stem from the professional workers' deepest knowledge, experience, and skill in close exchange of opinion with the board, advisory committee, or parent organization. When purpose, function, and policy grow from the combination of professional recommendation and lay approval, the agency program may be seen as potentially sound and may look forward to a vital and progressive part in the community's range of services.

One cannot separate a consideration of the values of a fee service from the value of the agency's service as a whole. It seems logical, therefore, to apply to the development and administration of a fee service the same principles outlined for developing and administering the total program. If it is agreed that no segment of the agency's service is unrelated to the rest, nor stronger nor weaker than its other segments, then the problems of administering the fee service may be accepted as no different from the over-all administrative problems. Speaking simply out of the not uncommon experience of social agency executives, this writer would say that there are difficulties and also satisfactions in the administrative task.

In order to weather the gales of public opinion and to keep the course clear for any social agency the administrator of a service must have two positive convictions: first a belief in the strengths, as well as an understanding of the weaknesses, of human beings, whether they be clients, board members, or staff; and second a belief and confidence in the strengths and skills of the social casework profession.

Both of these convictions are prerequisite to the decision on the part of professional casework staff and administration, alike, to institute and use effectively a fee charge which is made applicable to all clients. This statement is made bluntly because of the interesting difference of opinion in professional circles as to the kind of fee charging deemed appropriate to social agencies. One major reason

for differences in attitude toward the advisability of charging fees seems to stem from two doubts within the profession, about the profession itself. One doubt is expressed by some social agency executives and their staffs as to the degree of skill in serving their clients which is necessary before an agency can expect to charge fees. Such a doubt would indicate a serious weakness within a profession which offers service to clients of any economic status. Professionally trained caseworkers do not hesitate to accept their own salaries, hence it may be questioned why certain of our colleagues hesitate to take responsibility for establishing and conducting a service which might merit the charging of fees. One can only review the previous statement regarding our professional conviction that all people have strengths as well as weaknesses and that we respect their inalienable right and, for the most part, their ability to choose a way through their problems to a more effective way of life with whatever help they require in this process. At this point any agency may well raise questions and find clear answers before including or continuing to include fee charging in its program.

The questions which may clarify the philosophy regarding fees are:

1. Does the agency, that is, its professional staff and its board, really believe in the strength of the people whom it serves, or does it consider first their weaknesses and give support to their dependence?
2. Does the agency feel assured of its own professional strengths and skills in offering help to its clients?
3. If not, what is the agency doing about employing more adequate professional caseworkers who can supply skilled help to people in need of it?
4. And last, but perhaps most basic, what right has any agency to offer a service for which it feels apologetic, to any man, woman, or child regardless of his or her economic status?

If these questions are clearly answered, the conclusions should not only help the agency to decide whether or not its board, staff, and community are ready to start a fee practice but also the executive of the agency to handle the problems which occur in administering a fee service.

In conjunction with an agreement between board and staff that a fee system become an integral and presumably a constructive part of the agency's program, there must be a choice between charging a fee to all clients of the agency and selecting a group of clients who may be expected to pay fees. In either choice the first problem in administering is to determine how much or how little a fee should be. The second problem is to interpret charges to clients and likewise to the community. The third is to collect the fees by means of smoothly operating procedures, and the fourth problem is to set up a means by which fees, as a source of income to the agency in relation to other sources of support, become a real and integral part of an operating budget.

In the first instance, assuming that an agency decides it is ready to charge fees, it frequently experiences confusion and a destructive reaction to its service if it requests a group of clients within a certain income bracket to pay fees, while other clients receive free service. This dilemma occurs largely because the emphasis is placed upon clients' income rather than upon clients' need for service. In the dilemma, the agency which has not sufficiently clarified its philosophy of service may assign its best qualified caseworkers to handle problems of clients selected as able to pay while those clients deemed unable to pay, receive service from less well-qualified and less skillful staff. A question, then, to be raised and fully answered is which clients have the greatest right to skilled service, those who have comfortable incomes or those who have not? It is assumed that most caseworkers would agree that problems brought to any agency merit consideration and service whether they be the problems of individuals with high, medium, or low incomes, or of financially dependent persons; likewise, that problems which properly fall within an agency's function are presented by clients in all these income categories.

It is possible of course, but not logical, to separate problems by categories within one agency's function and to charge, let us say, all marital counseling cases a fee regardless of the client's income bracket, while at the same time rendering free service to clients whose children present problems of behavior and social maladjustment. Since this would be obviously an artificial mechanism for

separating fee-paying cases from those given free service, it seems clear that it would be equally artificial to assign the most highly skilled casework personnel to the first category of cases and the less experienced and skilled to the second. This may sound like a legal sequence of argument, yet for this writer it has deep meaning in the professional caseworker's sense of the term. It may convey to some readers of this paper a timeworn but still valid reiteration of our profession's basic philosophy and ethics. So may it be applied to fees and the administration of a service which dares to include fee charging as an integral and vital part of its casework practice.

The first problem of making the decision to charge fees to all clients having been met, the second problem to be faced is that of the amount of fee. It seems obvious that relatively few clients can pay the total cost of service rendered even on an hourly proportion thereof. Yet a minority of clients can do so. Taking an example from the child guidance clinics and from the more progressive day nurseries for children of working parents, other service agencies may apply a sliding scale adjusted to income and number of persons dependent upon such income. The initial step toward setting up such a fee scale is to study the budgets of a cross section of individuals or families, to review further current living costs in a given community or area, and to determine the actual unit cost of service. The last factor may be arrived at by dividing the total cost of the agency's operation by the number of clients served in a comparable period. If, as in family counseling services, it is possible to determine the average number of hours of service required by each case, it is further possible to determine an approximate cost of service per hour. Should the approximate hourly cost be five dollars, then the maximum fee per hour should be five dollars, with the charge graded downward to a nominal sum of twenty-five cents or more per hour. Such fee scales are available from certain child guidance clinics and from day nurseries. One real advantage in using tabulated fee scales is that the client in deciding, with the worker, what his fee should be in relation to his income and number of dependents is not subjected to an examination of his budget when such emphasis upon income and expenditures is unrelated or only indirectly related to the problem with which he is asking the

agency's help. The worker is also freed from assuming a responsibility, which he has no right to assume, for determining for the client what amount he can or should afford to pay. The tabulated fee scale is a concrete, fair, and objective mechanism for indicating the agency's policy in charging fees. It removes from the worker and from the client the onus of discussing the method of determining the fee. It can become one means of helping the client to assume his fullest share of responsibility for his use of the agency's service, even for his decision to accept or to reject the opportunity to use its help.

In this concept of the value of charging fees lies the basis for the administration's instruction of staff in handling their part of the fee service. Hence the third administrative problem may be readily solved. When casework personnel become facile in charging fees for service, there should be less difficulty in handling all other procedure related to it. Such procedure involves the method of handling the payment of fees by the client and the agency's receipt of this revenue. In this writer's opinion, no caseworker should be required to accept payment from a client, because of the strong emotional complication of the exchange of dollar bills for a meaningful service rendered. This feeling lies deep in the sensitive emotional structure of most individuals. Money is a poor means of translating the value of the relationship between client and caseworker. Therefore, the receipt by the worker of a symbol of value received by the client is often not only artificial, but impractical. The clerk, receptionist, or secretary who is designated to accept fees from clients is apart from the kind of professional relationship which develops between client and worker. This clerical person is, like the caseworker, an important representative of the agency and must become skilled and responsible, as is the worker, in handling her part of the fee charging process. Her job is an integral, but more objective, less professional factor in helping the client to use the agency's service. Her method of approach to the client should be as unidentified with his personal problems as is the budget toward which he makes his payment. This concept of fee collection method implies that the administrator must plan a simple and smoothly functioning procedure, which includes instruction of the

various staff members handling it and the method by which the caseworker, having determined the amount to be charged and the adjustment of fee charges at various times for a client whose income may fluctuate, conveys the decision to the clerical department. Similarly, the clerical department must be required to render to the executive or department head an accounting of fees received, in order that such receipts may be analyzed in terms of an essential or important budget item. From executive to case supervisor, therefore, must come the continuing assignment of evaluating the importance, constructive or otherwise, of the use of fee charging as a factor in the service to clients: From case supervisor to executive must come reports indicating the value or lack of value of the fee as an integral part of the use of service and the difficulties involved for casework personnel in their responsibility for their service to clients.

Throughout these continuing evaluations, the administration of an agency must carry responsibility for the interpretation of professional experience in relation to fees, to board, and to community. In the public relations aspect of the executive's job lies the task of giving the community a chance to express what it feels and thinks about fees as well as to put before the community through various media of interpretation, such as the press, radio, motion pictures, articles, and talks, the way in which the agency's service operates, the purpose, and the results.

One extremely necessary consideration with respect to fees as a source of income is the agency's ability to account for income from fees as a factor in the development of budget estimates. This factor becomes increasingly important as community chests, country-wide, raise the question of agencies' ability to supplement chest grants and the chests' apparent inability to supply funds adequate to meet the growing costs of service.

From this writer's experience in the past, an agency may anticipate as much as one third of its income for operating expenses from client participation in meeting the cost of service. Likewise, it has been true that the majority of clients prefer to share the expense rather than to accept free service. As an example of this one may repeat the common statement that people value more those

things and those services for which they pay. Generally, it is true that planning the budget expenditure, even sacrificing to make it possible to spend what is required for a desired objective, puts a more meaningful emphasis upon acquiring it and upon the process which promotes that goal. This last concept of the value of fee charging in the practice of social casework may raise the level of professional practice and its agency framework to yet a higher and sounder economic level, consistent with those of other and older professions yet distinct and separate from them.

The test of these changes from a free service, supported by gift or by taxation, to one in which service is purchased by the clients who want it and use it, lies wholly in careful evaluation of effective client-worker relationships through which the client is helped to gain a more self-sufficient and satisfying way of life.

The Place of the Sectarian Agency in Services to Groups

By NATHAN E. COHEN

CAN THE GROUP WORK METHOD AND OBJECTIVES be fulfilled in sectarian settings?

In seeking an answer to this question we must attempt to understand more clearly what we mean by sectarian agencies and their relationship to the democratic way of life, for it is only within the context of democratic values that group work as a method and process has real significance. Democracy as a way of life did not spring full blown out of American soil but rather has its roots in the history of man's centuries of attempts to live together in the various forms of associated living. Each period of history has wrestled with the problem of human relations and has contributed to the development in the succeeding stages. Democracy in its present form has its roots in Judaeo-Christian ethics, English law, humanist philosophy, and modern science. No one of these influences of and by itself, however, is the equivalent of the democratic way of life which in essence represents a new *Gestalt* evolving from the dynamic relationship of these influences rather than the summation of a series of static elements. Any attempt to isolate elements and regard them as the equivalent of the whole results in an artificial and misleading abstraction. Democracy, therefore, as a philosophy of life, is broader than the philosophy of any of the groups practicing within it. In fact, it is because of this greater breadth that groups with different ideologies and emphasis can function. It must never be assumed, therefore, that the fullness of democracy can be approached merely through one of its sources of influence.

Democracy in this broader form, namely, as a way of life, is a system of ethical concepts which must pervade the totality of human relationships, be they political, economic, social, or spiritual,

if its fullness is to be achieved. Democracy in this form implies a basic set of beliefs in relation to people and society such as the following:

1. There is a quality of goodness in every individual regardless of race, creed, color, or origin of birth. The approach to man is in terms of these potentialities, that is, not only in terms of what he is, but also what he can become if dealt with justly and if given equal opportunity.

2. Man is essentially a rational being, and we have faith in his ability to learn, to think, and to participate in making decisions of policy to which he will adhere. Man can not only learn his rights in a democracy but also develop a sense of responsibility to other men and their cooperative undertakings.

3. "Democracy . . . involves the acceptance of social organization and social action, not as an alternative way of life, but as one of the basic facts of life without which human society could not exist."¹

4. Democracy recognizes the desirability and essentiality of both government planning and private community undertakings for human welfare.

In order to develop this type of citizen without which democracy cannot exist or expand, all social institutions, such as the family, the school, the group work agency, and the church, must utilize a method which is essentially democratic. It must be a method of approach which will contribute to intellectual independence, to learning how to think rather than what to think, to emotional security, and to the ability to accept change as an inevitable part of life be it in the economic, political, social, or spiritual area. There must be a constant revolution going on in democracy against all forms of enslavement be they political, economic, social, or spiritual.

The uniqueness of the group work method is not only that it reflects the psychological and social needs of the individual but that it reflects these within the context of the needs of a democratic

¹ Bryn J. Hovde, "The Group as an Instrument in Training for Democracy," *Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work*, 1948 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1949), p. 432.

society. In the same way that we cannot understand the individual apart from the society in which he functions, so it is impossible to realize a democratic society made up of individuals without democratic values. The group work method grows out of the recognized interrelatedness of the individual, the group, and the larger social body in which they live. Any attempt to view these aspects separately will result in a fragmentation of the group work method. Carried to its extreme, the fragmentation can be such that the knowledge of the individual psychologically and the group sociologically can be utilized toward antidemocratic goals such as in the case of the Hitler Youth Movement. The committee of the American Association of Group Workers which defined the function of the group worker were mindful of this point when they included in their statement the following: "The guiding purpose behind such leadership rests upon the common assumptions of a democratic society; namely, the opportunity for each individual to fulfill his capacities in freedom, to respect and appreciate others and to assume his social responsibility in maintaining and constantly improving our democratic society."²

Let us turn now to the sectarian question. Webster's dictionary defines "sectarian" as follows: "Of or pertaining to a sect or sects, especially of a religious character. Denominational in character or interests especially narrowly so; characterized by bigotry; as a sectarian mind."

If the second half of this definition represented our starting point it would be necessary to state immediately that it runs counter to the objectives and principles of group work. Sectarianism, however, must be viewed in relative rather than absolute terms if it is to be dealt with in the light of the democratic process. A more realistic set of criteria for approaching the problem is suggested in the study of the Protestant welfare federation made by Dr. Leonard Albert Stidley. He states that "broadly speaking, social work is sectarian insofar as it is controlled by a religious or cultural group and is motivated in the interest of the group. The social work of a sectarian group may, however, exist for the purpose of serving members

² "Definition of the Function of the Group Worker," *The Group*, XI, No. 3 (May, 1949), 11-12.

of the group only, or may also serve persons who do not belong to it." ³ This definition permits the establishment of a scale which at one end would consist of those agencies whose "purpose and control are not of, by, or for any particular religious or cultural group but rather operate on a neighborhood, group, and community basis." At the other end of the scale would be those agencies which are of, by, and for a particular denominational group. In between would be a variation of patterns such as of, by, and for more than one denomination, and of and by a particular group or grouping but for members of all groups.

Utilizing this yardstick we find that where the agency is sponsored by a denominational group for its own members it is primarily an extension of the program of religious training and education. If the denomination follows the path of narrow sectarianism, the chances are that it will try to hold its adherents through dictated ideas and beliefs, trying to offset all contrary ideas from without. It will regard as a divine obligation the imparting to youth of its specific philosophy of life, based on predetermined standards. In such situations the group work method could not be utilized without compromising some of its basic principles.

Another pattern, especially among Protestant groups, is the sponsoring of community services without regarding them as part of the church's religious education program. In such instances the church is interested in helping to meet community needs for all and in promoting broad humanitarian goals as an expression of Christian faith. Frequently, projects may be initiated as a demonstration until the community or state takes over the responsibility of control or support. As stated by Dr. Stidley:

Since Protestants stressed the supremacy of individual belief and good deeds, as the result of "saving faith" it followed that they did not hold the churches to be the sole agencies for the bestowing of charity nor church members to be the sole recipients. It was also consistent that Protestants, on the whole, encouraged the state to assume major responsibility in charity.⁴

³ Leonard Albert Stidley, *Sectarian Welfare Federation among Protestants* (New York: Association Press, 1944), p. xiii.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

Agencies of this type, although under church sponsorship, might well have many of the characteristics of a nonsectarian project. In fact, much nonsectarian social work has had its origin in this type of sponsorship.

A further pattern resulting from this same philosophy is that of the interdenominational or intersectarian agency, such as the Young Men's Christian Association and the Young Women's Christian Association. The moment an agency attempts to serve more than one sect it must go through the experience so essential to the larger democracy, namely, the development of a base of similarity without destroying the right of difference. Since difference is largely around the institutional aspects of religion rather than around values, the larger intersectarian grouping represents a step forward in breaking down narrow concepts of sectarianism. Furthermore, since the agency cannot align itself with any one denominational group, programatically it will seek an approach that avoids teaching of traditional beliefs but rather focuses on developing an individual who lives his Christian philosophy. The following statement from the staff of an agency of this type is a good example:

The best method of teaching a philosophy is through providing opportunities to live it through teamwork on the gym floor, arriving at democratic decisions in a club meeting, sharing crayons in a play group, working for the larger community in a consumers council. . . . There is an honest concern for each person as an individual as well as part of a group.⁵

Agencies which have had to plow their way through an intersectarian experience motivated by broad and liberal religious principles have tended to show a greater interest in continuing ever to widen their circle and sphere of service.

The pattern in the Jewish field has followed a similar trend. The Jewish center as it is known today had as one of its primary concerns providing all Jewry, regardless of religious denomination, economic and social level, or political beliefs, with an opportunity to work together around common Jewish and general community

⁵ Wallace Lornell, "The Use of Social Group Work in the Protestant Church" (master's thesis, New York School of Social Work, Columbia University, 1949), p. 33.

interests. The Jewish center, catering as it has to all groups in Jewish life, has focused more on the cultural aspects than on a particular religious approach and on ideals rather than traditional beliefs. Its concern philosophically for democratic values can be noted in the following statement by Louis Kraft:

As an American institution our fate is bound up with all free American institutions and our first responsibility is therefore to be of service to democracy. We can be effective only if we make democracy real in the life of the Center. We cannot teach democracy unless we practice democracy; we cannot help our children and youth to understand its values unless we afford them opportunities for practicing democracy in their activities at the Center. . . . In a sense we need to view Jewish Centers as laboratories for experiment and practice in democracy, as places where groups may function freely and where individuals in those groups may learn, through activity, to cultivate attitudes of cooperation, respect for the rights and opinions of others, and mutual helpfulness.⁶

The Jewish centers too, like some of the broader based Protestant agencies, were pointing outward toward the community and the larger democratic society rather than attempting to siphon off individuals from the larger society into a narrow and more limited point of view. The Jewish center movement consists in the main of Jewish centers but also has as affiliates a number of synagogue centers. It is interesting to note that the group work method has had less success in the synagogue centers than in the Jewish centers, especially in the case of those which regard their program merely as an extension of the religious education service and primarily for the membership of the synagogue.

At the other end of the scale we find those agencies whose purpose and control are not of, by, or for any particular religious group but rather, operate on a neighborhood, group, and community basis. In this category we find such agencies as settlement houses and boys clubs. In terms of open membership regardless of race, creed, or color, they may provide a greater opportunity for the fulfillment of the group work method. On the other hand, as already indicated, the group work method must be seen in its

⁶ Louis Kraft, "Impact of the World Situation on Center Policy," *Jewish Center*, XVIII (March, 1940), 2.

entirety and not merely in terms of one particular aspect. Thus we find that in the boys clubs and in some settlements the approach may be primarily recreational without full acceptance of the group work method or the utilization of the trained group worker. In other words, the mere absence of religious sectarianism does not necessarily insure the existence of the group work method.

In brief, there are no prototypes in a democratic process. Because of historical differences, differences in community composition, and numerous other factors, patterns of agencies will vary. It is not enough, therefore, to look at the extremes or even where agencies are today. More important is to evaluate where they are today as compared with yesterday, and the direction they seem to be taking for the future. Variations in patterns can be a sign of strength providing they all have as a common concern the strengthening of the democratic process. This would imply the existence of an open process which permits change and recognizes that values are functional rather than static or absolute.

In this connection, as I pointed out in 1949, there is evidence of a growing trend toward a greater degree of sectarianism in the private group work agencies.⁷ Some of the agencies described above which had broken through the pattern of narrow sectarianism seem to be engaged in a struggle between a return to the more traditional approach and a holding fast to their more liberal religious outlook. The Jewish Welfare Board Survey is an example of this conflict. Dr. Janowsky, the surveyor, states: "The most important conclusion of the survey is that the Jewish Center should have a Jewish purpose—that it should be an agency with which the Jew might identify himself in order to satisfy his specialized Jewish needs . . . programs of Jewish Centers should devote primary attention to Jewish content."⁸ Even when adequate recreational facilities are available the Jewish Center should be built. Janowsky says further:

⁷ Nathan E. Cohen, "The Function of Social Group Work Agencies in a Democracy," *Social Work in the Current Scene*, 1949 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1950), p. 198.

⁸ Oscar Janowsky, *The Jewish Welfare Board Survey* (New York: Dial Press, 1948), p. xxiii.

There has been marked hesitation and often downright opposition to the stimulation of positive Jewish interests. Such a course has often been equated with "sectarianism."

The emphasis upon "the self-expression of the individual," upon "creative experience," and upon the "realization of the individual as a whole," has provided another justification for the passive role of the Jewish Center as regards an affirmative Jewish purpose.⁹

Dr. Janowsky indicates in his study that many basic group work concepts are subordinated to Jewish content and, furthermore, that a primary requisite for Jewish Center workers should be Jewish education and a knowledge of Jewish customs.

There is also a growing controversy in the Y.M.C.A. and the Y.W.C.A. over the amount of emphasis on Christianity in their approach.¹⁰ Paul Limbert points up the issues sharply in his book *Christian Emphasis in Y.M.C.A. Program*,¹¹ in which he quotes Harrison Elliott as follows: "Creative group work is not necessarily Christian group work. Boys need to be enlisted in developing groups which in spirit and practice are Christian." Dr. Limbert in stressing personal contacts, says that the Y.M.C.A. should "seek to push personal contacts back to fundamental Christian insights about God, society, and personal responsibility." He also gives a possible portent for the future by saying, "It is quite likely that the time is at hand again in Y.M.C.A. circles to approach religion more directly."

This trend toward the fulfillment of more narrowly defined religious purposes comes at a time when agencies have opened their doors more and more to all inhabitants in the community. Caught up in a conflict they have devised different levels of membership, with only those who will sign a pledge that they believe in the Christian purposes of the agency being eligible to vote. There is a contradiction in this procedure, however, in that it is a gesture of democracy on the one hand and the creation of second-rate citizens on the other. It is almost as if we are standing at the crossroads trying to determine whether to continue on the road that

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 248-49.

¹⁰ Material in this section based on Lornell, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

¹¹ Paul Limbert, *Christian Emphasis in Y.M.C.A. Program*, (New York: Association Press, 1944), p. 32.

is marked democracy, or fatigued and perhaps having obtained an inkling of where the road might lead, including the potential conflicts with our narrower interests, we are seeking the way back with the rationalization that this means moving forward. It is in moments like these that the past begins to loom large and provides the security of direction even if it may frequently mean retreat. Whereas at one time our agencies served the purpose of helping individuals move into the larger sociological stream and thereby to contribute to a changing society, they seem to be moving toward a function of keeping them out of the larger stream and away from influences which might stimulate an interest in change and new groupings around new-found interests.

As part of our rationalization in such periods of conflict we tend to make an even greater fetish than usual of differences. Now differences are important providing they are interwoven with sufficient emphasis on similarities to provide enough unity for moving ahead toward a greater fulfillment of democracy as a way of life, toward a greater concern for the welfare of the whole. As stated by Norman Cousins,

Man must decide what is more important, his differences or similarities. If he chooses the former, he embarks on a path that will, paradoxically, destroy the differences and himself as well. If he chooses the latter, he shows a willingness to meet the responsibilities that go with maturity and conscience. Though heterogeneity is one of the basic manifestations of nature, as Spencer observed, a still greater manifestation is the ability of nature to create larger areas of homogeneity which act as a sort of rim to the spokes of the human wheel.¹²

In brief, although agencies may utilize different highways and byways to reach their goals, and although differences can contribute to the richness of the whole, there is need for sufficient emphasis on similarities as well as differences if over-all goals are to be achieved. There should be room and opportunity for the choice of instruments, but if harmonizing of differences is to result, all groups must play the same piece of music. The piece of music in this case would be a democratic symphony whose theme has already

¹² Norman Cousins, "The Obsolescence of Modern Man," in *Approaches to Group Understanding*, ed. Lyman Bryson, Louis Finkelstein, and Robert MacIver (New York: Harper's, 1947), p. 367.

been described as including: (a) a belief in the dignity of the human being; (b) the placing of human rights above property rights; (c) a belief in people's ability to help and govern themselves; and (d) a faith in the democratic process as against dictatorship.

The trend we are going through is no doubt a reflection of what is happening in society in general. It is a reflection of the economic, political, and social changes which are taking place, changes which will affect not only the settings in which the group work method is utilized but perhaps "its whole spirit and technique as well." There are signs of a tendency, for example, of placing more and more emphasis on adjustment in the narrow psychological sense and less and less on preparation for citizenship in a democracy. This type of fragmentation will make it easier to utilize group work in even the narrower sectarian settings, but it will no longer be the group work method as originally defined. No one part of the definition is a substitute for the whole and of and by itself is something completely different.

We seem to have wandered a bit afield from the topic. That which drew us into the broader direction was the growing realization that we are entering into a period of sectarianism which goes beyond the religious definition of the term. Any form of narrow sectarianism be it religious, political, economic, or educational, presents a danger to the full utilization of the group work method as we have described it. It is to the broader issues of our democratic values that we must give heed if the problem of sectarianism is to be met in true democratic fashion.

Group Work with Hard-to-reach Teen-agers

By ESTELLE ALSTON

IT IS OUR PURPOSE to show that teen-age groups known as "gangs," or as the "hard-to-reach," can be helped to attain better social adjustment through the application of group work principles. The principles discussed are generic to social group work in any setting. The methods and techniques are those which the Los Angeles Youth Project Special Service Unit staff have found most effective. Much of our staff meeting time for several years has been spent in analyzing failures and successes and working toward a body of knowledge regarding group work with deviant teen-agers.

The history of the development of the Special Service Unit, is a long story in itself.¹ Briefly, the zoot suit riots in Los Angeles in 1943 mobilized the youth-serving agencies into action, resulting in the setting up of the Los Angeles Youth Project of the Welfare Council of Metropolitan Los Angeles. Its purpose was to provide funds through the Community Chest to existing youth-serving agencies to extend services into what is now known as the "Youth Project area." This area covers about one fourth of all Los Angeles and includes the districts with the highest rates of delinquency and child dependency, the highest rate of health problems, substandard housing, and the lowest income families.

The Special Service Unit is a part of the Project. It is not an agency or part of an agency program. It is a service unit to the youth-serving agencies in the project area. Its function is to work with teen-age gang groups which are usually not reachable by youth-serving agencies or by traditional youth programs. Its objective is to help these groups achieve a degree of organization and an acceptable way of handling behavior so that they can be integrated into normal

¹ See Duane Morris Robinson, *Chance to Belong* (New York: Woman's Press, 1949).

agency programs. Its aim is also to assist the agencies in adapting their own policies and program to serve more effectively these hard-to-reach groups. It is the development of techniques and methods of applying group work principles and the development of a process which accomplishes transferral of these groups into regular agency programs which have made the Unit in reality a service unit to the agencies.

Because of the stereotyped impressions around the words "delinquent" and "gang," the Special Service Unit staff rarely use the terms. Much of the publicity about teen-age gangs is misleading. Gang fights are but one of the ways in which the problems of teen-agers manifest themselves. Other common outlets are sex delinquency; use of marijuana and heroin; chronic truancy, shoplifting, and auto thefts; and destruction of property.

These groups develop manners of dress and speech which set them apart from other teen-agers in the community. Much of their conversation is about girl friends and boy friends; about the time they were in jail or juvenile hall; and the fights they have had. In general, they are hostile, suspicious, egocentric, oversensitive, and discouraged. They have given up trying anything which is constructive—they are afraid of failure. They cannot participate effectively in school or in youth programs. They have difficulties in finding and in keeping jobs.

The causes of problem behavior are varied and the symptoms, too, vary widely. The common denominator seems to be that these adolescents are basically insecure and have learned socially unacceptable ways of handling their problems. Through their naturally formed groups they seek security, status, and an outlet for their hostility. Their individual feelings and behavior are reinforced by the values and standards of the group, which tend to be revolt against all that represents authority. Their unacceptable behavior patterns set up further conflict with parents, teachers, playground directors, and policemen. Most of the adults in their lives have failed to establish the kind of relationship which would make it possible to influence their behavior.

Many of these children come from broken homes or homes in which there is constant quarreling, overly strict discipline, or—

equally bad—inconsistent discipline. Other factors intensify family relationship problems. Substandard neighborhoods, first-second generation conflicts, extreme poverty, poor employment opportunities, and second-class citizenship for minority groups create feelings of low status, resentment, and hopelessness.

The effects of discrimination because of race or nationality origin show up constantly, and second-generation conflicts and language problems are common in the areas in which we are working. Many parents are from Mexico and speak little, if any, English. Much of the Negro population has come recently from the Southern states. Children are ashamed of their parents' social inadequacy, of their inability to speak English, of their accent. If parents are overprotective, the children learn to play them against the unsympathetic authorities.

Once a youngster or his group has been categorized as "delinquent" or "gang" the community makes it very hard for them to change. Far too many adults who are associated with these youngsters have prejudices which not only prevent them from helping, but intensify the problems by proving to them that everyone is against them, and that there is no use to try. The situation is not always entirely the fault of the parents. It is a community problem, and the proper treatment of adolescents with problems includes education of the public and of public servants.

The Special Service Unit accepts referrals of teen-age groups which cannot participate in a regular agency program. In working with these youngsters we have two tools which are indispensable and inseparable: relationship and program.

In his first contacts with the group—or its natural leaders—the worker must establish enough of a relationship so that group members are willing to accept his help with activities that they want. Early in the process, the leader uses activities to learn to know the group and its members and, more important, to give them a chance to know him. As they develop confidence in him he is able to encourage them to broaden their experiences. Through program the group develops a more constructive cohesion and a common desire to raise their standards as a means of attaining their goals. Finally, the worker transfers his relationship to a leader in an agency, using

program to help the group accept a new worker. It takes from a year and a half to two years to accomplish this.

The Unit worker spends a great deal more time with the group and its members than would be given to a group in an average club program. He becomes an important part of their life and their community. He works with the group as a whole and with the members individually. He helps them through counseling, by "going to bat" for them with teachers and at court, and sometimes by making referrals to casework agencies. The Unit carries an average of twelve groups at a time. A full load for a full-time worker is two or three groups, depending on the stage of the group development.

Because the Unit is a service unit to the Los Angeles Youth Project we accept groups upon referral from community sources which are aware of a problem in a particular district. These may be youth-serving agencies, housing project managers, or recreation directors, police or probation officers, principals, or attendance officers. The referral is made through a Youth Project coordinator who helps determine whether there is an agency program which can serve the group. If there is none and if staff is available, the Unit accepts the assignment with the understanding that it will transfer the group to agency leadership when it is ready for inclusion in a regular program and an agency is prepared to accept the group.

The referral process and the worker's first approach to the group have undergone a change since the Unit began operation, six years ago. Formerly, the Unit worker went into a problem neighborhood with no previous knowledge, outside a gang name, of those with whom he was to work. He frequented malt shops and hot dog stands, getting acquainted with the neighborhood and trying to make contact with the gang. This was a slow process, especially for the non-Spanish-speaking worker in a Mexican neighborhood. It took too long to overcome suspicion.

Two factors have helped improve methods of referral and approach. One is the communities' growing understanding of the help that can be given to hard-to-reach teen-agers through club groups. The other is the growing recognition of the teen-agers that a club group can help meet their needs.

The community is learning how the Special Service Unit can be

used. The Youth Project coordinators have done much to further this understanding. Referrals are now made of specific groups, with the names of at least one or two of the key members. The worker's approach varies according to the nature of the group, its known problem, and who makes the referral.

The vice principal and the attendance supervisor of a junior high school referred a group of Negro girls who had been involved in a series of incidents including fights and thefts at school and on the playground. On the way home from school they stole candy and small change from smaller children. Some were on probation for sex delinquency. Most of them had dropped out of school or had been sent to one of the city's schools for problem girls.

The Special Service Unit worker talked over the approach to the girls with the vice principal and the attendance supervisor. The attendance supervisor thought that her name should not be mentioned as the girls had too much resentment against her office. It was decided that the worker would visit the girls and tell them that she was forming a club in the neighborhood and had gone to the school to ask for names of girls who were not already in clubs.

It took several trips to find some of the girls at home, though the worker thought she heard sounds from within at some of the homes. When they did come to the door, both the families and the girls were reserved and suspicious. She mentioned the names of the other girls who had been referred, but none admitted knowing each other. The worker talked about forming a club but did not press for an answer. She told them she was visiting all the girls and would keep them informed on how the club formation was progressing. This gave her the opportunity to make several home visits to each girl. She talked about the activities they might have, asking for interests. They talked about records and music, and the girls were surprised that she knew their kind of music. She talked about other clubs she had worked with and brought up subjects about which she knew they would have questions.

The girls agreed to meet at a playground suggested by the worker since they had no suggestions themselves. They did not show up, however. The worker then used a "name" band concert as the occasion of the first get-together. She picked up the girls at their homes, and they brought along some of their friends. They were quiet and restrained and seemed afraid to enjoy themselves. But on the way home they asked about getting together again and set a date to meet at the home of one of the girls.

At this first meeting it was obvious that they had done much talking together about a club, and they began to discuss a name, club sweaters,

club rules—arguing among each other. Some who had seemed quiet during home visits proved to be loud and boisterous. Some kept dashing out to see if boy friends had arrived. They kept glancing at the worker to see how she was reacting to their smoking and language. Yet in their hectic group discussion it was evident that they wanted their club to have status and a “good name.”

Our first approach to most of our girls' groups has been through home visits. With the boys' groups we sometimes find it better for someone already acquainted with them to introduce the worker as a club worker or “coach.”

The Wildcats were referred by an agency worker who realized that his work with a gang in his area was hampered by the traditional rivalry between the two groups and frequent raids between neighborhoods. The probation and police officers provided names of boys known to be involved in gang activities in the Wildcat neighborhood. The worker did not contact them directly but visited the youth-serving facilities in the district. He discovered that everyone's experiences with the boys had been bad; as a result, the boys had been denied the use of the playground and housing project community facilities. They were known to drink intoxicants and smoke marijuana. The worker was warned that he could not do much with the boys. However, he found that the staff at a small church center knew the families. The boys themselves sat around on the lawn of the center and were known to one of the sisters at the center. The sister introduced the worker to the boys as someone who could help them with their activities. She also suggested that the worker visit their mothers, telling them she had sent him.

The mothers, some of whom spoke Spanish only, responded gratefully, telling the worker, who also spoke Spanish, of their feeling of not being wanted in the community. The boys were very suspicious and—unaware of the worker's knowledge of Spanish—said that they did not think this was going to be worth anything, he would be like all the rest—and maybe he was a cop. As the worker talked about club activities and tried to feel out their interests they were rowdy and disorderly and some walked out. They said they could not go to the playground, they were not wanted there. They showed some interest in boxing. One of the boys said he could bring a punching bag. The worker said they could construct a frame for it, and the boys then wanted to help. Each one sawed and hammered with such vigor that he did not want to give up his turn, and they wanted to keep it up after the frame was constructed. When the punching bag was hung, some of the boys hit it with a baseball bat, and the owner took it home. But they had worked with the worker long enough to begin to like him and

have some confidence in his interest. He was able eventually to induce them to go to the playground. They were afraid they would be thrown off the ground, but he assured them that he had talked to the director and as long as they went as a club they would be allowed. With this they had made a beginning.

We have had some of our most effective referrals from an officer in one of the police districts. He gives the boys "another chance," suggesting club membership as one way of staying out of trouble, and offers to help find club leadership for them. Needless to say, it takes skill on the part of the officer and the worker to overcome the feeling that membership is not compulsory. One group told the worker, after they had been organized for over a year, that when the officer had suggested a club they had said "yes," but had not intended to have anything to do with the workers.

Hard-to-reach teen-agers in Los Angeles are more ready for leadership than we are prepared to give it. Increased services to these groups through the agencies, public and private, as well as the Special Service Unit has given status to groups that have "sponsorship." It is not uncommon for groups who come to activities given by "sponsored" groups to ask if they can have a sponsor and a club of their own. This expression of readiness does not mean that they can accept a traditional club program, but rather that they are ready to accept the kind of leadership and program that they see other groups of their kind getting.

It is difficult for an adult to "get in" with a closely knit teen-age group that wants to exclude adults. They accept the adult as a club adviser who can arrange for program and for facilities and transportation before they are fully confident that they can trust him. If the worker is unfamiliar or ill at ease with their cultural background or if he is insecure and too worried as to how they will accept him he has a longer and more severe testing period. Student workers new to this kind of group, or workers just beginning with problem groups, find that it takes a much longer period to feel that they are accepted by the group. When a worker has established a relationship with a group, his own security and sureness become his biggest assets.

Much early testing by the group is just talk, and the worker who

takes it too seriously can be thrown into a panic. The plans they discuss in front of the leader before they really know him are not what they will actually do. They are apt to hide their real problems until they have more confidence in the worker, and then he can handle them better.

Minority youngsters are particularly sensitive to the worker's attitude. They do not expect an outsider to be sympathetic with their culture, and if the worker is someone of their own origin, they suspect him of thinking himself to be better than they are.

The Tigers had been referred by the police officer directly to the worker. They talked among themselves in Spanish, excluding the Negro worker except for short answers to his attempts to discover their interests. Early meetings were held in the worker's car since they did not accept the facilities of any center or playground. Early program consisted of trips to the beach or just "cruising." As they began to know the worker better one would occasionally interpret what another had said. One day Johnny asked the worker, "What do you think of us Mexicans? We aren't any good, are we?" As the worker discussed objectively the situation of minority groups the boys began to feel closer to him. The worker noticed that they began to use more English with him, and later they took an interest in teaching him Spanish.

Relationship comes slowly and builds on increasing confidence and shared experiences. Sometimes the turning point is when the worker can help a member who is in trouble. Frequently, the fact that a boy is a club member means that he will be given another chance. The realization that someone is interested enough to help him may give him a new lease on life. Even if the worker can do no more than visit the boy in jail or juvenile hall and talk on his behalf and visit with the parents, the fact that the worker has shown so much concrete evidence of genuine interest will "sell" him to the club members as an "all-right guy."

The importance of relationship cannot be overstressed. The Special Service Unit worker must work toward building the kind of relationship which will permit him to influence the attitudes and values of the youngsters, or at least help them find more acceptable ways of handling conflict situations. The Unit worker has a particular advantage in achieving this kind of relationship. He is not at-

tached to a building or to a standard program. He represents no authority. He makes it possible for them to use facilities, but if they are refused or ejected he goes with them. He is free to move at their pace, because he is not under pressure to show results within a specified period of time.

The leaders of girls' groups especially have the opportunity to become acquainted with the families. First contacts are often made by home visits to the natural group leaders. The parents may be overly strict, especially if the girl has been in trouble. They may not permit her to go out until they have confidence in the worker. The worker may call for the girls before each meeting. Sometimes parents are so distrustful that a club member may want the worker to go to her home so that the parent will know she has been with the club.

The Unit worker is in a unique position to observe the teen-ager in his natural environment, surrounded by the people and things that have meaning to him. The worker observes the youngster's relationships with his family, his friends, his group, the school, and also his attitudes toward his neighborhood and toward authority. The goal of the group worker is to use the group to develop the standards and self-control of the members. The process is slow, and in times of emergency the worker may have to rely upon his relationship with the group and its members to control a situation.

The Top Hats were all steamed up for a fight with a rival gang in a neighborhood where they were to play a league game with a community center team. The worker knew that if he called the game off the boys would go into the other neighborhood on their own, looking for the other boys. He decided to have them play the game. He reminded the boys that they would lose their chance to play in the league if there was a fight. He persuaded them to give up most of their weapons to him before leaving their own neighborhood—and after the game he hurried them away. If he had not already developed a good relationship with the boys he would have been unable to control this very tense situation.

These groups, though they have a natural cohesion, are unable to participate in organized activities. They are easily frustrated and give up at the slightest discouragement. If they want a club meeting they frustrate themselves by their lack of self-control, or else they can only function under a strong natural leader who acts as a

dictator. Early program must be at the level at which they are able to participate. That level may be very low.

It took three and a half months for the Wildcats to be able to go to the playground and practice baseball. They were afraid to show how inadequate they were and gave up easily. With much encouragement from the worker they were able to practice. The first time they played another team they were so far behind in the first inning that they walked off the field.

The worker urged them to practice more and then arranged for them to play against a younger group. They gradually developed confidence and were able to play other teams that were not too skilled. When basketball season arrived the worker was able to get them into a league with groups of similar development. Meantime, the group had a variety of activities—co-ed parties, outings, and a week's camping trip.

The worker helps the group learn to plan and to follow through on these plans by helping them with activities which they want.

The Dukes and Duchesses, a co-ed club, wanted to give a dance to make money so they could buy sweaters. Their idea of planning was to set the date and determine the price of admission. At the workers' suggestion, committees were set up, but no one followed through. The club members came by every once in a while to see if anyone was there and then left to come back later. The dance was a failure. Finally, when no one came, they went off to crash another party. They were discouraged about the results. The workers urged them to evaluate the dance by asking why they thought it had failed. Finally, out of their own discussion, they were able to realize that each of them had been expecting someone else to take responsibility. Over a period of a year and with encouragement from the workers they were able to learn how to have a successful dance with each doing his share.

Teen-agers will set group standards and keep each other in line if they feel there is something to be gained by it.

The Red Devils had the usual problems of drinking and fighting. They were also responsible for breaking up many parties in their neighborhood. If they were not invited they crashed the party or broke it up by fighting.

Their ambition was to give a pay dance of their own. The housing project hall where they met was barred to teen-age pay dances, because of the fights that had occurred. The worker suggested a series of parties in which they would invite their own friends and prove that they could have an affair without fighting or drinking.

They controlled each other because of their desire to have a good af-

fair. The test came when the natural leader became angry at a drunk party crasher from another group and the club members restrained him from fighting, telling him not to "mess up" by starting a fight at their party.

Trips to the mountains and outings to the beach give the leader the opportunity to know the members better. Week-end camping trips have been invaluable in furthering workers' relationship with individuals and groups.

In 1950 a special fund was donated for a two-year summer camp experiment. We tried a variety of programs. Each group camped as a unit with its leader and an assistant. The most successful was the outdoor camping in a national park, with the club members responsible for preparing their own meals. In the summer of 1951 all groups will participate in that kind of camp. The camp program as a whole speeded up the process of developing relationship and group controls.

As the group develops standards and members begin to change their attitudes, they themselves are aware of the change. Many times they are aware that the club has helped them. A member returning to the group after a session in a probation camp or a state school is often told, "We don't act that way anymore." One girl, who had just returned from a state school, was fighting and swearing and behaving as the rest of the group had behaved a year before. Two of the group members remarked to the worker that "Mary would have been better off if she had stayed with us and had been in the club."

When a group shows that it can control its own members, and functions with a fair degree of organization, planning, and follow-through, the worker begins to wean them away from his leadership. He spends less time with them until at the time of transferral to an agency he is meeting with them once a week plus occasional special events. The agencies in the community are then approached to determine whether leadership can be provided. Their leadership must be skilled and the agency policy flexible enough to meet the needs of the group. Sometimes transferral is delayed because agency staff is overcrowded. However, there is a genuine effort to make staff time available to accept a Special Service Unit group.

It is the relationship of the Unit worker with the group that is

being transferred to the agency worker, so the process must necessarily be slow. The agency worker may first be introduced as a friend of the Unit worker. Whenever possible it is arranged that he have some specific function, such as helping with transportation or chaperoning a dance or trip. As the group and the agency worker begin to feel comfortable with each other and know that each accepts the other, the Unit worker begins to take a more passive role and the agency worker a more active one. This is worked out between the two workers. The Unit worker may tell the group that the agency worker can help them plan a dance or an outing. If the agency worker has some special skills he is urged to use them with the group. Before the final transferral, he may take over some group meetings in the absence of the Unit worker. Finally, the Unit worker explains to the group that he is getting heavier assignments from his office and must work with other groups. The actual details and manner of introducing the change of leadership depend upon the plan worked out between the two workers. Even then the break is not sharp. The worker may promise to visit the group's meetings or he may ask them to invite him when they have a special event.

The Special Service Unit worker works closely with the agency worker, interpreting methods as they go along. After the group has been officially transferred he keeps in touch with the agency worker. The agency worker can call upon him at any time for counsel. Problems do not cease with transferral.

Sometimes the members outgrow the need for a group experience, and the group naturally disintegrates or disbands. The Special Service Unit constantly evaluates each group and helps it disband if that is what seems best. Records are kept of the whole process from referral through the follow-up after transferral. These records are used by the Special Service Unit supervisor to help each staff member evaluate his work and by the staff as a whole to improve methods of working with hard-to-reach groups. Graduate students from the University of Southern California School of Social Work have used these records as research material for four different theses.

In working with hard-to-reach teen-agers there are failures as

well as successes. The Special Service Unit staff evaluates both and tries to learn from them so that we may improve our methods. We are convinced that hard-to-reach teen-agers can be reached and helped to better social adjustment. A group work program can affect a whole neighborhood as well as a group and the individuals in it.

No agency can work alone if teen-agers are to be helped. The Special Service Unit has a growing relationship with other agencies, both public and private, and we are learning how to work with each other.

As stated before, the teen-age groups in Los Angeles are more ready to accept leadership than the agencies are prepared to provide. The Special Service Unit is now experimenting by providing consultation service to agencies which want to serve more effectively the hard-to-reach. Even though agency staffs cannot provide the same amount of time that the Unit does, there is much that can be learned which will make it possible for them to do more effective work. Improvement of facilities alone is not enough. Leadership must be able to work with all teen-agers. There seem to be certain stumbling blocks which we find consistently repeated.

The most common excuse for not being able to help these youngsters is that they have a "poor attitude." Attitude is a two-way thing. A youngster's attitude is his reaction to our own, or to what his past experience has led him to believe it will be. If a youngster is "uncooperative" we have not established the kind of relationship that makes him want to cooperate, assuming that our demands are reasonable.

Then there is the strange idea that we must demand respect from teen-agers. Respect is never given upon demand. We have to earn it.

Another stumbling block is the tendency to rush the job. We want to change behavior as soon as possible, forgetting that it is caused by attitudes and values which change slowly.

Then there is the delicate problem of maintaining one's own standards while accepting the group at its level of development. Sooner or later the problem arises: How far can I go in accepting behavior without being guilty myself?

Every Special Service Unit worker learns that he must place limitations on the group. When he does so it is on an objective and realistic basis. It is not made a personal issue if the response is not immediate. "Don't mess up, kids, or they won't let us meet here" is more effective than a lecture on the evils of fighting and drinking. Time and again it has been proven that teen-agers want limitations. They want their leader to have standards. Teen-agers have respect for, and confidence in, the adult who is not shocked by their behavior but who will not contribute to their delinquency. And, finally, workers with hard-to-reach groups must have supervision which is acquainted with their special problems. Each problem as it is confronted must be worked out with each leader of a particular group. The worker must have freedom to be accepting and slow in results. Fear of agency reputation, of criticism from the community, and that one's job is in jeopardy create pressure for immediate results. These pressures serve to prevent the worker from thinking through the problem and planning on the basis of what will in the long run be best for the youngsters and for the group. They create the temptation for a leader to lecture, to exclude individuals and groups that do not conform, and otherwise try to force desirable behavior. When a crisis arises such a leader is in no position to exert influence. No matter how capable and skilled the worker, he needs the kind of supervision which understands the total problem. Sometimes the community's hostility toward these groups is projected on the worker. He must not be pressured into obtaining results too soon, or to identify too completely with the group.

There is not sufficient space to discuss all the aspects of working with hard-to-reach teen-age groups. Even though we are convinced that they can be helped, we are equally convinced that it cannot be done by one agency or by one kind of service alone. In Los Angeles we are just beginning to realize some of the potentialities for a concerted effort on the part of all agencies, public and private, volunteer and authoritative, which are serving children and their families. It is the responsibility of those of us who are oriented to a social work approach to take the lead in a continuing effort to learn how to work together to help youth attain better social adjustment.

Intercultural and Interracial Relations in Camping

By MARGARET E. HARTFORD

IN THE NEW YORK *Times* magazine section of April 15, 1951, appeared the following advertisement:

Camp Quannicut. Interracial, all faiths, extensive program designed for older girls. . . . Write Y.W.C.A., 131 East 52 St., New York City.

Ten years ago this advertisement would not have appeared in the *New York Times*—nor in any paper, as a matter of fact. Ten years ago this camp did not have a practice of serving all people nor would such a practice have been a desirable thing to promote—so that we would say that the most important trend in intercultural and interracial camping is the very existence of this practice and its expansion.

By "intercultural and interracial camping" we mean serving together in one camp people of different races, creeds, nationalities, and ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds. We mean housing people together, serving them food together, helping them to play together. We do not mean serving people of all races and cultures at the same time, but in separate tents or cabins or units, with separate programs. Neither do we mean having a token representation of one person of one grouping in a camp of another grouping.

We know that the practice of interracial and intercultural camping is not new to the social agency camping field. At least thirty years ago a few settlements and youth-serving agency camps had special interracial and intercultural sessions and conferences. There seems to be no possible way to get a total count of the number of social agency-sponsored camps in the United States, nor how many of these are intercultural and interracial, nor how many have become so in recent years. However, the Girl Scouts of the

United States of America report that in 1950, of their 650 established camps, 165, or 25 percent, were interracial. This compares with 14 percent in 1945. We also have heard from workers in cities throughout the country and from staff in the national program agencies that quite a few camps have successfully changed their policies in the past few years. As new camps are opened by agencies they tend to serve everyone. In one city the number of interracial camps jumped from four to eighteen in the last ten-year period. Interculturally, the practice always has been quantitatively better, but the quality has improved over the years.

This leads to what seems to be another trend. More conscious consideration seems to be given to what constitutes a good intercultural and interracial camping experience. No longer do camps accept the concept that to bring campers of all faiths, races, and backgrounds together is enough to make a good learning experience. Mere association may lead to deeper prejudices and more conflict if there is not good leadership to help people get along together. In the past eight years there has been much more attention given to interracial and intercultural camping in the American Camping Association and in the national agencies, as well as in various institutes and conferences. This conscious consideration reflects itself in more clearly stated policies, direct, uncompromising publicity, careful selection of staff committed to the promotion of the policy, special training of staff to work in intercultural and interracial situations, careful interpretation to campers and their parents, and planning of constructive and creative programs.

Camps which have had good experiences interculturally and interracially have included small camps of thirty-five to fifty, large camps of several hundred, boys', girls', and coed camps, young adult camps, and camps for older people. They have been sponsored by the various national youth-serving agencies and by local community groups. They have included camps serving only agency membership and those open to the community generally; they have included campers from a single neighborhood, and those coming from a much larger area—city, county, state, or region. Campers have come from economically deprived areas and from upper economic and social brackets. No single type of agency seems to have

an exclusive claim to good intercultural and interracial practice, and in fact a type of agency which in one community feels that because of its very nature it could not possibly open its camp to everyone is the same agency which is the pioneer with considerable success in another community.

Social work in a democracy is committed by its basic philosophy to help people learn to live together in peace and understanding. To this end some agencies, whose area of service is so limited that it is not possible for members to have interracial or intercultural experiences in their clubs, have joined other agencies in offering interagency cooperative camps. In several cities where this is true, such camps, organized and administered cooperatively, have provided an opportunity for members of the various agencies to get to know campers and staff of other races and backgrounds in a setting where they have the security of some leadership familiar to them and their friends from the year-round program. Such has been the experience in the camp operated by Emerson House and Parkway Community House in Chicago, beautifully demonstrated in the film *To Live Together*.

Now let us explore some of the details of interracial-intercultural camping. Recruitment practices vary, but whereas a few years ago the attitude that the "camp is open to all, on a first-come, first-served basis" seemed to prevail; today there seems to be a change in philosophy. Most camps operating on an intercultural-interracial basis are moving ahead consciously, quite aware of each step they are taking, using "camperships," using key community leadership of various groupings on committees, using descriptive movies and folders. Even camps with a long history of intercultural and interracial camping find that they must be ever vigilant in recruitment in order to maintain a continuous flow of campers from all groupings. Camps with a shorter history often have found it necessary to hold open places for the members of the grouping most recently included as participants.

The second aspect of the intercultural and interracial camp is interpretation of the policy to campers and their parents. The Chicago Boys' Clubs, as do many other agencies, has an individual interview with each boy and at least one of his parents. One of the

points discussed in the interview concerns what experience the boy has had with people of other races, religions, economic backgrounds, and nationalities, and what prejudices he may have. There is no question but that he will be camping with all manner of children. In the early years in intercultural camping there was a tendency to minimize the inclusiveness of the policy, by stating in folders and parents' letters that camp was open to "all boys," "all girls," or by providing scarcely visible interracial pictures in publicity. Over the years, too many camp directors have had to deal with irate parents and disappointed children who had been shocked by the experience of seeing Oriental, Negro, Spanish-American, Indian, and Caucasian children associating together. Camp staffs need the assurance that people will know what to expect and be ready to make the adjustment when they arrive at camp. To this end, a number of agencies have a pre-camp rally of all registered campers so that they may meet, play a short while together, and begin to get acquainted. In a camp like that of the Denver Y.W.C.A. it becomes obvious through this occasion that there will be Anglo-American, Spanish-American, Nisei, and Negro girls in camp together.

The trend in interracial and intercultural camping seems to be to house persons of different races and backgrounds together. A few years ago, camps experimenting in this field served people in camp together but housed them separately, with a tent of Negro campers and a tent of white campers, or separate cabins for Spanish-American campers or Mexican-American campers, and separate units of Oriental campers. Some camps which claim to be camping interracially, by their very structures of separate units for individual branches or centers or groups may actually be camping biracially. This is frequently due to the fact that our communities have so populated themselves that we have what seems to be voluntary segregation, compulsory segregation, or unwritten restrictive covenants so that branch, or center, or neighborhood groups may be very homogeneous in the in-town program. Thus where camping is done on the same basis as the in-town program is conducted, separation and segregation result.

On the other hand, many agency-sponsored camps are seizing the

opportunity of the camping situation, when the campers are away from the home environment and community mores, to give campers an opportunity to have good associations across racial and cultural lines and to have an experience in more democratic living. How to assign campers to living groups has long been a problem of all camps, and the patterns vary depending on the type of camp and kind of living facilities. A good number of camps seem to be following the pattern of housing two or three friends together with another two- or threesome. Where possible, all cabin groups or tents are interracial and intercultural. The Detroit Girl Scout Camp gives this matter careful thought and considers each child's record:

If it appears that she has had little occasion to get acquainted with different people, if it appears that she does not adjust happily or readily to differences, she is not included in a tent with persons too radically different. If the factors add up to a possibility of acceptance, youngsters of various races are housed together. This means some children have a tent experience, others a unit experience and still others may have only occasional contact in the life of the camp.

Of course, the mere assignment to living groups with one friend does not mean that the problem of feelings of difference will be resolved immediately. In one such camp on the first day a counselor stopped at one of the tents in her unit of eight-year-olds to see how the unpacking was progressing, only to discover a rope stretched across the center dividing the tent in two parts. Hanging on the rope was a large piece of paper. On one side it read, "White Only"; on the other, "For Colored." The interracial experience was new to these eight-year-olds who had lived all their lives in a Northern city, but the patterns of segregation had already left their marks. It is because attitudes such as these—fear and distrust, hate, prejudice, and ignorance—exist in our society today that social work has an opportunity, also an obligation and responsibility, to provide through camping the setting in which people can learn to know each other and themselves better.

Another example comes from a girls' camp where there were eight girls sharing the same cabin. On the first night as they were ready to retire some knelt by their beds, some said their rosaries,

some crawled into bed without any prayers. This started a discussion between the girls about their religious differences; one claimed that hers was the oldest religion, one claimed that only she had been "saved," one claimed that her people had protested against "all of that." Each of these girls was sure that she alone had the right religion, Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, and Eastern Orthodox. These girls needed help to find for themselves the common denominators as well as the differences in ways of worship so that their religious differences would not become a barrier to their moving ahead to build good group relations.

In these incidents the opportunity was ripe for a deepening of prejudice by mere association had there not been good leadership to take hold of the situation. Selection of staff and their training are most important. In the early years of interracial and intercultural camping, when most people were operating on a trial-and-error basis, directors attempted to find staff who wanted to work in an interracial or intercultural setting. Frequently, the staff who expressed such a desire turned out to be people with "causes" who went about hating everyone who verbalized the slightest amount of fear or prejudice and who, at the same time, were extremely patronizing toward members of minority groups. In recent years, camp administrators have been hiring people who seem to be as free as possible of prejudice and then have provided in counselor training courses and staff supervision actual opportunity to work on attitudes. It would seem to me that social workers have begun to realize that relatively few people who are products of an American culture and their family backgrounds are entirely free of some racial, religious, ethnic, or socioeconomic prejudice. This means that camp administrators are assuming responsibility for helping staff as well as campers to grow. Counselor training courses include such things as anthropological concepts of culture, race, religion, and ethnic backgrounds; psychiatric concepts of the dynamics of prejudice and fear; sociological factors about communities from which campers come; group work concepts of group adjustment, and progression in programing; and concepts about physical care. Such material is brought into training courses through the use of record material for discussion, the use of specialists for presenta-

tion of some facts, and in some places by the use of camp consultants from agencies like the American Service Institute in Pittsburgh and the Urban League in other cities to integrate the cultural factors all the way through the training courses. In many instances, the inclusion of such discussion in counselor training courses seems to have been rewarding as staff have been brought face to face with problems, and have handled them. They have worked on their own feelings during pre-camp training, they understood better the background from which their campers came, they felt equipped to handle interracial or intercultural situations, were clear on policies, and knew they had strong support.

Another trend has been the employment of a staff group which is interracial and intercultural in composition as well as competent in leadership. Several camp directors have indicated the value—almost measurable—of having an interracial team operating cooperatively as staff. One advantage is that when campers see staff working and playing across racial and cultural lines, they may feel easier about doing so themselves, for the adults are making it more socially acceptable. Secondly, the campers of various social groups or ethnic backgrounds feel freer and more secure to know that there are adults near by who have an understanding of them. We remember sitting in an office at camp one day and hearing two little boys saying in angry, frightened voices, "Did you see our counselor? *They* never give us enough to eat." "*They*" happened to be white.

Camp directors put competency in leadership first, but they also seem to be placing a high priority on the added plus of a person who has learned to accept himself, his attitudes, his race or culture, and is secure enough to help others grow in the same way—those who are like him, those who are different.

There are several other indications of trends which should be mentioned, however briefly. One is a clearly stated policy supported by board, camp committee, and year-round agency staff. We are moving away from the era of "we have no stated policy, but of course we serve anyone." Too frequently this has meant: "Nothing consciously is being done to promote intercultural relations, and no one is quite sure where he stands on it."

Another aspect is programing. In potential tension situations, or where there may be feeling of strangeness, program cannot be left on a hit-or-miss basis; it has to be good, interesting, and engaging. It has to be so wonderful that no one wants to miss any part of it, so that feelings of difference are forgotten in the fun. This, of course, is true for all group work, but camp administrators point out how essential it is to the interracial-intercultural camp. For a while some camp staff seemed to feel that special program content ought to be planned for the intercultural camp, that intellectual discussion around all our differences was important. When a situation arises, it may be handled, but intellectual discussion on race relations, introduced out of the blue by the over-self-conscious staff member, seems to be on the way out.

I have set down only a few indications of growth and change—perhaps discernible trends in the area of interracial and intercultural camping. Most important for us to remember is that people do not go to camp to be educated—they go to have fun.

I should like to paraphrase a statement which came from Soho Settlement of Pittsburgh camp several years ago. For the closing campfire each cabin group had been asked to prepare a brief statement of what camp had meant to its members. Mary Jane, representing the thirteen- and fourteen-year-old girls, most of whom had never been camping before, read the following:

We all think this camp has been fun. It's mostly a feeling and it's hard to talk about the way you feel. We thought we wanted to come to camp and we all signed up, but on the bus some of us wondered if we really wanted to come. Later when we told each other we discovered that we all had felt about the same way. Jessie worried about the outdoor latrines, Cassie wondered what kind of beds we'd sleep in. Some of us wondered if there would be white kids in our cabin, and some of us wondered if we'd have to live with Negroes. Jane said she decided that she came to camp to have fun and she wasn't going to let anything stop her.

We found out as soon as we got to camp that we all would be in the same cabin. We have discovered that most of us felt separated even though we lived together. After the first night, when we slept together, and then later after we had had several meals together, had cleaned the cabin, had played some games together, it didn't matter too much, we

all began to be friends. Some of us thought we'd be afraid to share a cabin with people of another race or people who had more money or better clothes, or believed in a different religion, but now we know that that didn't stop us from having fun. We found that we are all so much alike. All of us wanted to have a good time, and we did.

The Layman Examines Social Welfare in a Democracy

By SADIE T. M. ALEXANDER

THE MEMBERSHIP of the National Conference of Social Work is charged by the citizens of the United States, acting individually or through their duly constituted government, with the development and execution of a program to improve the health and welfare of all levels of our population. The children, the aged, the blind, the sick, the unemployed and the unemployable, the family life as well as the personality development and character-building of the people of these United States, are largely your responsibility. The services you render run the gantlet of human need and bring you into direct contact with the people. I venture to say that no other group of lay or professional workers has the intimate knowledge of the needs of all the people of our population that is possessed by social workers.

I fully recognize that your relationship to a client, to be effective, must be confidential; that many of your tasks are prosaic; that human need, being as old as man himself, is not a new and dramatic story. The public, centuries ago, accepted the text, "Ye have the poor with you always." But I should like to point out that in the Kefauver hearings and in the Great Debate, the public had presented to it, in language that it understood, the charges and the defense presented against these charges.

In contrast, we laymen too frequently do not comprehend the professional language of social workers, and we notice that sometimes social workers do not understand the language of their co-workers in related fields. Your reports, addresses, publications, are too often prepared for the profession and not for the laymen. Furthermore, you understand so well your procedures and goals that I fear you occasionally fail to realize that we laymen often do not

know what they are. How many public or private social agencies have undertaken by radio, press, or television—at times other than during the annual drive—to state in language a child can understand the reason for the existence of the agency and exactly how it attempts to accomplish its purposes? Because too frequently they are not given the facts in terms they can comprehend, many citizens look upon the public welfare agency as dispensing rights and privileges to which the individual is entitled, without qualification, and to the voluntary agency as a place where the individual should be permitted and has a right to enjoy himself without any responsibility.

If, as is true in some states and cities, the departments and boards of education obtain radio time and television channels to extend their services, cannot the departments of social welfare, which are of equal importance to our entire population, obtain equal use of these media of communication to interpret weekly, if not daily, their purposes and programs to the public? The influence these facilities have in creating public opinion gives to them a quasi-public nature, which in turn places a responsibility upon them and upon government to make their services available to social welfare agencies. The owners and officers of many radio and television stations often sit on boards of local councils and agencies. Educating them and our representatives in government to their duty in this regard is a public responsibility which, I submit, the National Conference of Social Work should undertake on a national basis and could successfully achieve.

Too often, the average citizen has not had interpreted to him, in a manner he can comprehend, his relationship to social welfare. This accounts for the failure of many of us to realize that the position of a citizen in a democracy makes him responsible for the kind of welfare program provided for his needs and the success or failure of that program. We know that we live in a democracy, but too few of us realize the responsibility of an individual in a democracy. The interpretation of this responsibility is not the sole duty of the social worker, but he may well point the need for a clear and continuous restatement of our democratic way of life from the pulpit, the schoolhouse, the union hall, and by every medium of mass com-

munication. It is vital to the success of our democratic way of life that the most educated as well as the least trained citizen understand that our theory of government rests upon a fundamental respect for the dignity and integrity of every individual; and that this conviction rests upon a far more basic belief: that we are all, Jew and Gentile, Protestant and Catholic, native and foreign-born, black and white, the children of one God, and as His children each one of us is entitled to equality of opportunity. For freedom, without equality of opportunity, is an illusion. There is no freedom, there can be no respect for the dignity of man, when any segment or level of our population is denied the same opportunities to work, to play, to shelter from the storms of life, that are afforded other men. These rights which we Americans devoutly pronounce as being God-given and proudly proclaim as the basis of our society cannot be achieved only by patriotic proclamations, by pious speeches, or by loud preachment. They can be fully realized only when each one of us assumes the responsibility not only to secure them for himself, but to make them secure for every inhabitant of this land.

"How," the private citizen asks, "can I, an untrained person, only a private individual whose name appears in no social register nor in any *Who's Who*, not even in a telephone book, assume a responsibility which even the Constitution assigns to the government in those historic words, 'For these purposes governments are constituted among men'?" Such a question, posed by a large majority of our citizens, clearly indicates how few of us realize that he, and you, and I are the government. The legislative bodies of our nation, state, and local community, the political and social leaders, are but the agents of Mr. and Mrs. John Doe, the people of these United States. We, the people, elect or select representatives to perform certain duties and for these purposes we invest them with specific powers. But man cannot delegate the responsibility that arises by his very nature to develop and support institutions that promote and leaders who support human freedom for all people. The readiness with which many of our citizens blame the public and private officials, whom they have elected and whom they can remove, for the failure of our social and economic institutions is the same atti-

tude that caused the average German to feel no personal guilt for the barbaric slaughter of 6,000,000 people of Jewish blood. Because we, the people, are the government, we, the people, cannot relieve ourselves of responsibility for what government or our private representatives administering public or voluntary agencies do or fail to do. The rest of the maturity of democracy is the extent to which the individual citizen accepts responsibility to the community voluntarily and with a moral sense of duty.

Judged by this test, from my experience as a lay worker in social welfare agencies for more than twenty years, the social welfare agencies, while often serving a large segment of the population, have not always been equally successful in securing voluntary acceptance of responsibility by the community for the planning and execution of their programs. Many citizens view their relation to social welfare institutions as that of the annual solicitor, or the contributor to the community chest and the not-too-cheerful bearer of an ever increasing tax burden for the support of public welfare.

Having made a chest contribution in services or money, and having paid his taxes, Mr. Average Citizen returns to his home or business, satisfied that he has fulfilled his obligation to his community and his country. His failure to participate further is frequently the result of confusion. He is confounded by the mounting chest goal; by the confused thinking among social workers themselves as to whether federated financing leads to greater expenditures and whether failure to reach the chest goal should result in effective services to fewer people or a reduction of services to the same large group.

Mr. Average Citizen is confused by the conflict he observes between practice and preachment within some welfare agencies. He hears the social welfare agency described as democracy at work; which, in most cases, he hesitantly admits it is. The failure, however, of one agency or council to effect democratic practices in its operations overcomes in his thinking the good example of the others. Mr. Average Citizen's mind is obsessed by what he observes at the undemocratically operated agency. There he sees that every word spoken by the big contributor to the chest is usually accepted by the other board members and the executive as law. He recalls

that the last executive opposed Mr. Big Contributor and soon thereafter tendered his "voluntary" resignation. He thinks the solution is a change of board members. He finds, however, that in his town, the same people usually sit on a majority of the boards, both public and private, and that rotation of board members only results in these same people moving to membership on another board. He decides to raise the problem at the annual membership meeting.

Now, Mr. Average Citizen is a member of a church and of a union. He is accustomed to discussing the plans of these organizations at their meetings and taking an active part in the selection and election of their officers. Indeed, he feels that his presence is important at all meetings of his church and of his union, where his co-workers always seek his opinion. Therefore, he feels confident of his ability to effect a change of board members, when he will speak at the agency's annual meeting. But when he attended that meeting he found the situation quite different from his previous experience. The secretary read a list of nominations for the board, which were adopted before Mr. Average Citizen knew what had happened. The executive read a report filled with figures he forgot and words he did not understand. The president praised the executive, and the executive "outpraised" the president. A few people shook hands, others stood around. Then everybody went home. Things moved so smoothly and clicked so perfectly that Mr. Average Citizen could not find a time or a place to talk, as he was accustomed to do at the church and union meetings. Perhaps this meeting—I hasten to state that it was not representative of all agency membership meetings—was, like some of our social welfare programs, too highly organized, too streamlined, for Mr. Average Citizen to find where his part came in the program.

Mr. Average Citizen who has had personal contact with a public welfare agency is also confused by the "social work assembly line." An attempt at orientation of the newcomer, or of the old-timer, is seldom made. The applicant for service is given a number written on a piece of paper. He becomes an object, and ceases to be a personality. He does not understand why he must wait indefinitely to be interviewed, nor why the interviewer insists, in his opinion, upon prying into his family history. Thus the citizen who contacts

many public and private agencies is frequently perplexed by their total failure to explain in language he can understand the goals and the processes by which the social worker seeks to attain these goals. A citizen whose thinking is thus confused by any of these causes cannot be effective. He cannot give full expression to his needs and desires nor can he intelligently carry out his obligation to support democratic institutions.

Social workers have an intimate knowledge of human nature and a highly developed skill in gaining the confidence of individuals. You have an appreciation of the interdependence of communities and nations, of problems and people. We laymen, therefore, look to you to develop, in collaboration with sociologists, psychologists, statisticians, and anthropologists, methods of activating man's sense of moral responsibility to society. Man is, by nature, gregarious. Tribal and group relations establish the historical evidence of this fact. We know that man exists in his fullest sense in fellowship. He does not thrive by isolation. If we are to harness this natural tendency for group association into productive community service, the social worker and scientist must, together, find the formula for motivating the human urge to be together into productivity for social well-being. There are literally thousands of men and women who desire an opportunity to participate in group activities. The Second World War brought out as volunteers countless numbers of people of all ages who never before had participated in community activity. Can only war motivate our citizens to their moral sense of responsibility to social institutions in a democracy? Perhaps social work's attention has too long, by reason of necessity, been devoted to plans and programs to remove human need and improve individual welfare.

Certainly so highly skilled a profession as social work can, if provided the resources, by scientific research find the motivating forces for group action for human welfare. Billions of dollars have been diverted from our economy to the production by the pure scientist of a force, so great that it threatens to destroy man himself. Cannot we, the people, under the direction and guidance of the National Conference of Social Work, arouse our government to a like support of research in the social sciences that will produce forces that

preserve and not destroy civilization, that will enrich and not distort human personality and our respect for human dignity? As you undertake any such projects, I direct your attention to the words of Daniel Burnham addressed to those entrusted with drafting the plans for our nation's Capitol: "Make no little plans; they have no magic to stir men's blood and probably themselves will not be realized. Make big plans. Aim high in hope and work remembering that a noble, logical diagram once recorded will be a living thing asserting itself with ever growing insistency."

Solving Health and Welfare Problems through Neighborhood Participation

By VIOLET M. SIEDER

IN YOUR COMMUNITY, are you faced with (a wide, if not shocking, discrepancy between professional social work know-how and actual practice in meeting the health and welfare needs of people?) Have your social agencies "pioneered," and successfully "demonstrated," the value of services only to have their usefulness (curtailed by limitations of staff, inadequate facilities, lack of public understanding, and insufficient financial support?) Do many of the citizens of your town still view with suspicion the professional social worker as a "do-gooder" who offers palliatives to the "poor-who-will-always-be-with-us," and whose tendencies to softheartedness and impractical idealism must be curbed by the more realistic, economy-minded folks? Are you living in a rapidly expanding area where the population is pushing out from the city to new suburban and county areas without a corresponding extension of community services, either public or private? Do you have citizen councils, civic associations, and other local planning groups springing up to solve health and welfare problems by offering services without knowledge of established and tested programs or the guidance of experts? If so, it is high time that your socially minded community leaders and social workers should assess the situation and make a concerted effort to close the gap between modern social work knowledge about people, their needs and problems, and current methods of rendering services.

This is doubly important today because we cannot afford the luxury of a society weakened by inadequate individuals upon whom the success of our democratic system depends; nor can we

undertake the financial burden of costly treatment made necessary by lack of preventive services. In short, in a period of defense mobilization, the urgency of developing and applying social science knowledge to community social services must be recognized as of equal importance to the continued growth and development of the physical sciences so important to industry. It is axiomatic that no society can be greater than its individual citizens, especially a democratic society.

Inherent in a democracy is the provision of opportunity for its members to exercise their responsibilities, rights, and privileges for determining, maintaining, and improving community services, and for creating a healthy social atmosphere for personal and family life. This ideal is hard to achieve in our industrial age when the individual is overwhelmed by the sheer bigness of government, industry, labor, and religious and social institutions, and when he is dependent upon many types of expertness in our economic, social, and political life. He is prone to blame "them" in Washington, the state capitol, or city hall, or the economic or political system as the great impersonal forces responsible for his state of impotence. He tends to feel or express no personal responsibility for the ills of his community. Such an individual is ripe for the seducements of a new political system in which he is promised an easy cure-all for his complaints; or he may become dependent upon men of influence; or buy favors at the price of a vote. Exposés by the Kefauver Commission and others offer bleak testimony to the prevalence of this attitude and practice. Here again is evidence of a society which places higher values on material gains than upon a way of life which is something to live by and sacrifice for—the democratic way of life.

It is significant that during periods of national stress or crisis—be it depression or war or defense—we become intensely aware of the discrepancies between the ideals of a democracy, which we want to preserve, and their practical application in our social institutions. We expect every man, woman, and child to rise to the defense of a way of life and are shocked by attitudes of lethargy or passive inaction. The truth is that we can hardly expect a show of strength in our body politic if its members have never had an op-

portunity to flex their muscles in the exercise of democracy. Going to the polls once a year is important, but, as we all know, it is not the full answer.

When folks lived in small towns, each person had an opportunity to make an important place for himself in his community, could express his viewpoint at town meeting, and keep in personal touch with the programs of his school, church, government, and other social institutions. Today we live not only in a society of organized bigness but also in a number of communities. Our community has become variously the world, the nation, the metropolitan area, the county, the city, or the neighborhood in which we live. Each of these communities is interrelated and interdependent. It is futile to hope for a strong world organization if any one of the links in his chain of communities is weak.

In the past, local communities have attempted to meet the health and welfare problems of their citizens largely through city-wide or county-wide agencies, or by metropolitan planning councils. Even the location of neighborhood centers, or decentralized branches of an agency, has been determined by city-wide leaders working through such community planning organizations as the community welfare council, city planning commission, housing authority, or through centrally administered agencies such as nursing services and family agencies. What is more, even after neighborhood programs are established, they are administered in most cases by a "downtown" board with little, if any, representation of the point of view of citizens for whom the programs were designed. Usually guided by outstanding citizen leaders of recognized reputation, by experts and specialists, and backed by powerful interest groups, plans for community services are too often developed for rather than with the citizens whom they are designed to serve.

This approach is patently a violation of a basic social work premise, namely, that successful treatment of social problems must be based on a recognition of the problems and a willingness to do something about them by the people most concerned. What social caseworker in 1951 would attempt to treat a behavior problem or patch a divorce by gathering all the facts, drawing up a plan, and demanding that the persons involved should "cooperate" or else?

What social group worker would force a group into a ready-made program in which the members were not interested or which they had not helped develop? Applying the same generic social work concept to community organization, we find that the dynamics of community planning is not found in a perfect blueprint master-minded by experts. It is found in an understanding and acceptance of the plan which can only be achieved through participation in its making and execution. The broader the understanding, the greater the chance for assuring the desired results, both in terms of use of the services and of their financial support.

If we accept (the principle of starting where people are—physically, mentally, emotionally, spiritually)—what are some of the other guideposts to solving health and welfare problems which may be traced to our growing body of social work knowledge about people and the communities in which they live? First, social work as a profession has been constantly pushing back of problems to their causes. Great emphasis is placed on preventive services. Thus we find concern for environmental factors, such as housing, play space, sanitation, zoning, safety, and a good social climate, including interracial and intercultural understandings. Educational programs on family life, parent-child relations, and symptoms of behavior problems are designed to give personal insight and early recognition of trouble requiring expert guidance. Much concern has been expressed for getting people and services together to prevent or to treat problems at an early stage of development. This involves both a knowledge and an acceptance of community services, as well as their availability.

Second (more and more emphasis is given to mental hygiene.) We realize the need for ego satisfaction through opportunities for self-expression and a sense of being an important participant in a group to which we have a sense of belonging. The concepts of interaction of individuals within the group and the art of group development are expressed in the current interest in group dynamics.

Third, social work has always been dependent upon other professions, such as medicine, law, psychiatry, sociology, and nursing. More and more it recognizes the interplay between housing, employment, city planning, law enforcement, education, religion, and

race relations as important to the social problems with which it treats.

If we agree, then, that social work of the future is not an isolated professional practice, but is an integral part of the social life of the community, we recognize that its effectiveness in solving welfare problems depends upon strengthening all aspects of community life through programs of prevention, practical application of mental hygiene concepts, and interpreting welfare broadly to include work with all related fields. The various social forces and programs which are treated as specializations at the national, state, or city level merge in the district or neighborhood of the city where they directly affect the lives of people. Here such concerns as health, delinquency, recreation, housing, rat control, family and child welfare, liquor control, old age, street lights, employment, and zoning make up the warp and woof of the pattern of life of the family and individuals. These interests, representing variously need or services, are interrelated and inseparable parts of the whole and together describe the kaleidoscopic variations between communities or their subdivisions or districts.

Out of our specialized approach to welfare problems there is a tendency to develop programs centrally which are directed to the various districts or neighborhoods of a city. This vertical approach to planning frequently results in a multiplicity of planning organizations, each promoting a special interest, vying for the same local leadership, and becoming competitively destructive of each other through needlessly working at cross purposes. Regardless of where we start with special needs, the interrelatedness of social problems inevitably leads to a broad or horizontal approach to planning in the neighborhood, the least common denominator of practical social organization for a democratic society. Experience indicates that a council through which all groups and interests can work together must be staffed by a central planning body and not by any one operating agency—be it schools, courts, recreation, welfare, health, or any other field of service. An agency-sponsored council which attempts to plan and act on problems broader than the function of the sponsoring body runs the risk of becoming advisory to a program or causing confusion in the city-wide planning picture. The

problem is how to preserve the strengths of specialization and at the same time assure a well-rounded welfare program with the full participation of folks concerned as users, contributors, and policy-makers.

By and large, the neighborhood or district of a metropolitan area as a social planning unit has been greatly neglected. It is true, of course, that in a modern city, much of our life is organized around our special interests on a city-wide or metropolitan basis rather than in terms of where we live. We belong to our industrial or labor organizations, professional societies, and social clubs on a city-wide basis. It is equally true that we have other ties to the community in which we live, shop, play, send our children to school, and vote. Our political life is still related to our residential district. As governmental services assume an ever greater importance in our lives, it becomes necessary to develop more direct channels of organized community expression between the electorate and the elected representatives. Political reform is possible only through informed citizen action expressed in terms of the neighborhood in which we live. Public officials and legislative representatives are more prone to pay attention to their voting constituents than to pious resolutions of a city-wide planning body.

Improvement of local playgrounds, streets, traffic regulations, sanitation, and other services are an immediate concern. Through the Parent-Teachers Association (PTA), the citizen keeps in close touch with the schools. He also works through church groups, social clubs, local businessmen's associations, fraternal groups, and social agency boards, committees, and group activities for the mutual interest of himself and his neighbors. All these interests are a personal concern because he actively participates in them, shapes policies, plans programs.

On the other hand, the social services offered by professional workers through agencies directed by prominent city-wide boards are remote from the average citizen, even though they are provided for his benefit. At times, these services are even resented by him. How often have we seen welfare programs established by the local PTA, the church, the social club, or the civic association without benefit of professional staff or guidance and in violation of recog-

nized good practice? Could it be that social workers and their boards are violating the basic concept of how to help people when they plan for and not with them? People use services they believe in and understand. This is best achieved through participation in planning program, shaping policies, and financing. Along with such responsibility goes a sense of local pride and a promotion of the use and support of services. This is equally true of rich and poor and middle-class communities through which people establish a sense of belonging and personal importance. Everyone needs a sense of personal value, not only to his family and intimate circle of friends, but to society. This can best be expressed through community activity. The neighborhood as a planning base offers an opportunity to multiply the number of citizens who can effectively participate in the management of their social life and welfare.

Just what are the opportunities for solving health and welfare problems in a neighborhood? Specifically, what are the channels through which the average citizen can get these satisfactions in the neighborhood in which he lives?

1. The first channel is through participation in neighborhood organizations which carry on projects affecting the welfare of his community. These include the PTA, church, civic organizations, union, business associations, fraternal groups, and others.

2. The second is through participation in social agencies, on local advisory committees and boards either as a volunteer or as a program participant. Scout troop committees long ago demonstrated their effectiveness as interpreters of a program. Local committees of Y.M.C.A. and Y.W.C.A. branches and community centers are also effective. In some communities, local advisory committees to district offices of family agencies, nursing services, health centers, and welfare departments have also proved useful. Less tried are citizen advisory committees in local neighborhoods for services directed to the area from a central office. Settlement houses and community centers, on the other hand, which serve only one neighborhood, offer to local citizens a number of avenues for participation. However, even here the policy board is too frequently without the voice and counsel of the people whom the agency is designed to serve. Is it any wonder, then, that in some

cities one finds in the same area a well-established settlement and another center run by so-called "indigenous" leadership with programs that hark back to the turn of the century?

3. A third and increasingly effective method of neighborhood participation is through the district community council. As neighborhood organizations and social agencies actively work to promote the general welfare of their part of town, they are bound to get in each other's way, or step on toes, unless they learn to work together. Citizens in metropolitan and urban areas throughout America have discovered that there is a better way, a more effective way, to meet their needs. They have created a twentieth-century tool for democracy—the district community council—as a practical answer for our day.

These councils, whose membership is drawn primarily from delegates appointed by organizations and agencies, and includes other interested citizens, serve a geographical subdivision of the city or county for the purpose of improving its social and civic life and of giving the citizens an opportunity to contribute to the welfare of the whole community. A single council frequently covers several cultural, ethnic, or racial groups and cuts across economic and social status lines. The size of the area served is determined in part by topography, main thoroughfares, and shopping centers and also by whether it is large enough to encompass a good cross section of organized groups, such as churches, PTA's, business associations, social agencies, neighborhood or block associations, and other civic groups. In larger cities a high school district frequently determines the area served by a council.

District councils are most effective when they are spread over many sections of the city, including wealthy, middle-income, and poor areas. What do they do? They work for better housing, use of school buildings as community centers, tuberculosis case-finding, health institutes, improving race relations; they attack divorce through courses on family life and arrange for counseling services through established agencies; they extend day care and playground facilities; they improve city services, such as police protection, garbage disposal, street lights, transportation facilities, and enforcement of zoning. They are both a device for prevention of social

problems through education and the elimination of social and physical hazards and for development of new or changed services to meet existing problems. Important by-products are the building of civic pride, the development of new leadership, and the counteraction of forces which tend to disintegrate the personality. They serve to make maximum use of local resources—physical, such as libraries, schools, and churches; manpower, including volunteer and paid leaders; and financial, assuring more generous giving based on personal conviction. They offer a practical method to our populous centers for giving substance to the democratic ideal of participation by people in molding and controlling their own destiny.

4. Finally, to achieve its greatest potential, planning in the district or neighborhood cannot be carried on in a vacuum, but must be related through established channels to city-wide planning bodies. This is important to prevent extremes of local self-interest and chauvinism, to keep neighborhood leaders aware of community-wide planning objectives, and to temper city-wide planning with the expressed needs and attitudes of local citizens. Such organizations as city planning commissions, housing authorities, boards of education, civil defense organizations, as well as community welfare councils find district councils a two-way street to the citizens they want to serve and from whom they need support to implement their plans. The district councils have proved an effective action arm for city-wide planning projects.

There are three major channels between districts or neighborhoods and city-wide planning bodies: (1) the vertical flow of information to and from district advisory committees and their city-wide public and private agencies and membership organizations, which, in turn, are represented in city or metropolitan planning bodies; (2) the direct channels between autonomous councils and central planning bodies; and (3) the formal relationships between an association or federation of councils and central planning organizations.

A tried method for accomplishing a satisfactory working relationship between community councils within a metropolitan area is a federation or association of district community councils. Such

associations of councils are in existence in Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Pittsburgh, Washington, D.C., Boston, Los Angeles, and a number of other communities. The associations are made up of delegates from each of the organized community councils which meet membership qualifications. Membership in the association usually includes not only those councils receiving staff service on a continuing basis through the community welfare council or other sponsoring body, but all the councils which want to affiliate and which meet agreed-upon qualifications or standards in terms of membership, structure, and program.

The purposes served by a federation or association of district councils include the following:

1. There is an opportunity to exchange experience on methods for tackling community problems and district council administration.

2. District councils working on the same or similar problems can coordinate their efforts in terms of fact-finding, planning, and action. By careful timing of approaches to community-wide agencies, or to public officials, they can achieve more effective results with less confusion.

3. The attention of district councils is focused on the over-all needs of the metropolitan area, and perspective is given to the special needs of each district. Priorities for projects can be established jointly and in a statesmanlike way.

4. Leadership discovered within the district councils has an opportunity to develop and gain recognition through participation in the association of councils and thus to supply new and valuable citizen participation in city-wide agencies and organizations.

The devices to facilitate a two-way flow between central and district planning include direct representation, specialized consultation, and staff service from generalists in community organization to district councils. In some cities, district councils hold membership in community welfare councils and are represented in council divisions or committees. They serve on city-wide planning bodies for such special interests as housing, race relations, and civic improvement. They seek advice from specialists in the fields of health, recreation, family welfare, housing research, and public relations on local planning problems. In some fifty cities, they look to the

community welfare council to provide staff service to assist in organizing and developing the district council program. In a few communities this service is provided through public auspices, as for example in Los Angeles, where the coordinating councils are staffed by the Probation Department; or in Kansas City, Missouri, where the Welfare Department serves the councils; or in Baltimore, where they operate under the Youth Commission.

Experience indicates the great importance of professional community organization staff in helping local citizen leaders develop studies, seek out appropriate resources, coordinate competing activities at a level where status and credit are all-important, educate neighbors about services and standards, and take effective action to bring about change. Staff skill is required to keep the district council from succumbing to the temptation of operating a community service program and thus lose its identity as a planning organization. The big problem is not how to stimulate such councils; for there is plenty of evidence that neighbors are getting together to plan and operate services, with or without the benefit of skilled advisers from the social work "clergy." The problem is to time advice and be a step ahead by offering a helping hand at the point of sound planning rather than to spend endless hours and money later, patching up or redirecting misguided efforts.

In a "Policy Statement" adopted in October, 1950, by the Board of Community Chests and Councils, Inc., we find a guide for community organizers which expresses such high-sounding ideals as the belief that services should stem from the needs and desires of all the people, and that each individual has a responsibility to meet his own needs to the extent of his ability. It recognizes that people are interdependent, and that the welfare of each affects the welfare of all. It assumes that it is natural and necessary for folks to form organizations to work for their mutual benefit. It states as a fundamental premise of community planning the acceptance of change and development of social services to keep pace with change in social conditions, in knowledge of social problems, and in concepts of human well-being—physical, mental, emotional, and spiritual needs. It points to a primary responsibility of the community planning organization for the promotion of action that will result in the successful application of conclusions reached through its

studies, projects, and committees. And, finally, it expects agencies and organizations to be self-determining and autonomous, while at the same time they are interrelated. In short, it proclaims that community planning is a democratic process.)

In these history-making days, when democracy is on trial, do we have the courage, in our agencies, membership organizations, official bodies, and planning organizations to prove that such a sound philosophy is indeed a workable reality? Are we willing to practice what we preach as social work gospel and start where the people are, let them determine their own needs and help shape the programs to meet them? If we really believe in people, can we lose? The alternative, that of relying on a central core, top-down approach to planning is bound to result in a continuation of welfare operations on a limited basis. By controlling the demand for inadequately supported services through keeping people ignorant of their availability or potentiality is surely a dishonest use of professional knowledge. Let us accept the challenge, and put some responsibility in the hands of the folks at the grass roots. Perhaps we could reap some new services, more nearly meeting real needs; truly achieve our objectives of prevention; and generally shake ourselves out of the groove of complacency and discouragement about the limitations of a status quo.

Indeed, if we are to meet the problems of an expanding population in the suburban and county areas adjacent to our cities with tested programs, which are up to recognized professional standards; if we are to close the huge gap between social work know-how and current practice; if we are continuously to build public confidence and financial support of social work programs—then we had better create some modern machinery to make it possible. To reach out to “each individual,” involve every interested “autonomous organization,” and achieve a maximum of participation, understanding, and responsible action, we must build, not only through a central planning organization, but also through the neighborhoods or districts of our great metropolitan areas. This must be a two-pronged approach of city-wide leaders and citizens in every part of town. Only then can we develop the health and welfare services which form the cornerstone for the foundation of a democracy.

Critical Issues of Council-Agency Relationships

By RAY JOHNS

Critical issues do exist between community social welfare councils and direct-service agencies in many communities today. The issues are varied. They involve planning and financing relationships; they are related to council and chest and agency objectives, structures, and procedures.

Restlessness, dissatisfactions, and even tensions became recognized as sufficiently general in 1949 that Community Chests and Councils of America and the National Social Welfare Assembly set up a special committee to explore the causes of misunderstanding and to suggest methods for their solution. The results of that committee's work have been published.¹ In the course of another study of interagency relationships,² 503 social agency staff members in 47 cities identified 633 different barriers to effective relationships. In the same study, chest and council executives in 56 cities were asked whether they had noted any particular restlessness or dissatisfaction among agency personnel regarding interagency relationships, joint planning, and federated financing. "A great deal" was reported from 16 $\frac{2}{3}$ percent of the cities; another 58 $\frac{1}{10}$ percent reported "some restlessness and dissatisfactions"; workers in twelve cities, 21 $\frac{1}{4}$ percent of the total, reported "very little"; and in two cities, reported "none." These latter returns represent too few communities to be statistically significant, but the fact that three fourths of the chest and council executives in over fifty cities in different parts of the country recognized dissatisfaction and tensions, combined with the more extensive data from agency workers,

¹ *Toward Improved Chest-Agency Relations* (New York: Association Press, 1951).

² Ray Johns and David F. DeMarche, *Community Organization and Agency Responsibility* (New York: Association Press, 1951).

does suggest that candid exploration of some of the more troublesome issues is both timely and appropriate.

At the same time, the issues ought not to be overdramatized. They need not be overemphasized. This is an "age of anxiety," according to the poet Auden. It is a time of tensions. Restlessness and concern are part of the current social climate. Some dissatisfaction, even some tension, is to be expected at any time where healthy organisms exist. They are inevitable in periods where needs are expanding and functions are changing. They ought not, however, to be ignored. They need to be understood—their nature and their causes; they may suggest where changes can well be made.

Council-agency relationships cannot be understood without also taking into account chest-council and chest-agency relationships. Planning and coordination and operation of agency services are all influenced by the availability of funds and how they are administered. This discussion will therefore deal with chest-agency as well as council-agency relationships.

Four critical points of relationships will be discussed: (1) conflicting organizational demands; (2) financial pressures; (3) service-extension and community-balance pressures; (4) adequacy of planning procedures. A number of underlying forces and factors will also be considered: (1) psychological and emotional factors; (2) organizational problems; (3) understanding of the nature of cooperative ventures; and (4) skill in joint relationships.

Conflicting organizational demands.—Some of the most perplexing and critical issues facing councils and chests and agencies center in conflicting organizational demands. Responsibilities seem to overlap. Councils and chests have been established to develop a community program which is more adequate in terms of distribution of services and quality of services. They are responsible for study of unmet needs, for initiating plans to extend services and, where necessary, to curtail services; they are responsible for leadership to secure adequate funds and for allocating them in relation to community needs. But direct-service agencies have similar responsibilities. They study needs, at least the needs of part of the community. They provide the services. They are legal entities; they have their own legal and ethical responsibilities.

Some of the problems and misunderstandings which have developed out of these conflicting organizational demands were stated by the Hollander committee³ as follows:

The functions and responsibilities of agency boards and their freedom to discharge those responsibilities, together with the extent of the authority of the chest and council, need clarification.

For example, it is charged that some chests are guilty of undue interference in the management of the internal affairs of participating agencies. Strict "line-by-line" budgeting has been a source of tension.

. . . .

Chest and council boards should represent community-wide interests. Some chests and councils do not observe this principle adequately. . . .

Agencies, too, need to observe this principle. The base of support for community services has broadened enormously in recent years, yet the governing boards of many agencies have failed to keep pace with this development.

. . . .

The lack of agency understanding and acceptance of chest-council policies and procedures is a frequent source of tension and difficulty. Active resistance to these policies and procedures on some occasions by some agencies has led to open conflict.⁴

Clarification of respective functions is definitely needed. The service agencies, though most of them were organized before councils and chests—and though they helped organize the interagency bodies—need to accept more generally the over-all planning and coordinating and joint financing responsibilities of the councils and the chests. They must recognize that councils and chests have a definite and inescapable responsibility to the givers and to the leadership of the whole community. They must recognize, and ought to define more clearly, the specific ways and the degree to which they have voluntarily limited their autonomy when they joined the interagency bodies. They cannot, at the same time, have the full freedom of nonmembership and the advantages of membership in a federation. They can well insist on their right and their responsibility to help make joint policies. But they cannot, as re-

³ The Hollander committee produced the report, *Toward Improved Chest-Council Agency Relations*, previously mentioned.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 15 ff.

sponsible participants, evade adherence to jointly established policies and procedures. They can also well review the composition of their governing bodies to make them more representative, not only of their own constituency and clientele, but of other important community interests.

Councils and chests, on the other hand, need to understand the nature of their own organizational structure and that of their member agencies. They have their own institutional entity, as legal bodies and as social institutions. But they have a special type of representative structure: they derive their right to existence, in a very real sense, from the agencies and other community groups whose interests they represent and whose work they coordinate. But having been created for specific over-all community purposes, they have their responsibilities and must be free to meet them. Fact-gathering and analysis must be done competently and cooperatively. Facts must be faced, realistically and persistently. Plans for action—for adjusting services and for expanding services to meet changed situations and new needs—must be developed by council and chest and agency people working together. Patience with frozen patterns of service and structure is necessary, but patience with generally recognized outmoded ways of doing things can become a vice rather than a virtue. At the same time, as Edward L. Ryerson has stated, "agencies are the senior partners in this great co-operative enterprise . . . no great gain can really be made and consolidated without their active and enthusiastic co-operation."⁸ Such problems require superior leadership rather than authority, but with the interagency bodies and the service agencies each focusing sharply on their respective parts of the total responsibility and working intelligently, with mutual respect and confidence, effective and harmonious relationships can be maintained.

Some of the structural problems involve local-national relationships. The Hollander committee noted some of these relationship issues:

⁸ Edward L. Ryerson, "Freedom within Federation," *The United Way of Financing Health and Welfare Services* (New York: Community Chests and Councils of America, Inc., 1950), p. 8.

The failure of chests and councils to understand the relationship of local affiliates to their national organizations is one of the causes of misunderstandings and tensions.

.

In some chests and councils it is believed that the policies of some national agencies are developed without proper regard for local needs and without adequate consultation with their local agencies and with local planning bodies.⁶

Local affiliates do have a responsibility to their national organization to follow agreed-upon national policies. They also have a responsibility to keep their local councils and chests informed of such policies. In an increasing number of agencies, national policies are established with the participation of local agency representatives and with local needs and other established services taken into account. Channels of communication, between councils and chests and local agencies, between local and national agencies, and between local planning bodies and national agencies, now not always understood and followed, can well be improved. Improved printed materials and frequent clearance and consultation can be made increasingly useful.

Conflicting organizational demands can be greatly reduced, if not eliminated, by more clearly enunciated structures and policies and procedures, by provision for necessary representation, and by more effective channels of communication.

Financial pressures.—Financial pressures have become unusually acute in recent years of inflation and rising costs and have complicated relationships. The cost of providing direct services and the cost of planning and coordinating and joint fund-raising have all risen sharply. Needs for services of all types have greatly expanded. Two decades of depression and war and postwar and undeclared war have created an accumulation of equipment and facility replacement needs which, combined with the unprecedented increase of separate campaigns for more easily dramatized medical needs, have created frustrations and tensions. More inclusive campaigns, more widespread campaigning, and more effective budget-

⁶ *Toward Improved Chest-Council Agency Relations*, pp. 18 ff.

ing procedures are being tried as solutions. Plans for supplementary fund-raising for operating budgets are being pressed by some agencies. The principle of federated financing has gained increasing support. Its value as a means of providing more adequate financial support and as a means of achieving a sounder community-wide program, and its necessity under modern community conditions, is being more widely understood. Agency responsibility for producing more income is being more widely accepted. Supplementary financing efforts, when properly restricted by agencies, can be a way of developing stronger agencies, as well as increasing financial support, but they must not jeopardize federated financing if joint efforts are to be continued.

Service extension and community-balance problems.—"How can normal development of new services and growth of existing services be made possible?" the Hollander committee asks. It comments:

There must be new life and there must be growth if a community's program and its agencies are to be vital. But how can growth not only be permitted but encouraged, and kept in harmony with a balanced total program? Sometimes . . . agency . . . experimentation with new methods or services [has been encouraged by councils and chests], but has met with agency resistance. In some cases, agencies have found their [councils and] chests resistant to the organization of new programs or to program changes.⁷

It is true that the pioneering of certain agencies has been responsible for many of today's essential services. Imagination and initiative must be encouraged, but there must also be orderliness in meeting community needs. Provision for joint review of plans and for experimentation must be made, but new and expanded services must be developed in relation to an over-all community plan.

Councils and chests are sometimes faced with the problem of a disregard for balance of local services. It has been claimed that some national organizations have at times stimulated expansions and standards and budgets of their local affiliates. The "greatest good for the greatest number" rather than the interests of any particular group or agency must be a primary guiding principle. Active participation of agency representatives in council planning

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 29.

processes is essential. Councils and chests, at the same time, must help identify and interpret unmet needs and support plans to meet them.

Another major problem is how to bring public agencies into effective planning and coordinating relationships. Councils and chests, possibly because of financial relationships, have been far more effective in developing effective planning with voluntary agencies than with tax-supported agencies. Many public agencies have been inclined to develop their programs in terms of over-all needs and have not always taken into account existing services and the appropriate role of private agencies in the total pattern of community services. Some voluntary agencies have been reluctant to relinquish services or to adjust services. With public agencies now providing approximately 90 percent of all social welfare funds and a major proportion of the total services, they must be brought more effectively into the work of councils.

Adequacy of planning and coordinating procedures.—Councils have been in existence for many years, and extensive experience in planning and coordinating services has been accumulated; but services in most cities are still greatly out of balance, and a great many ineffective agencies still draw heavily on community funds and obstruct the development of more adequate services under other auspices. Many councils have done a great deal of effective work, but improvement has been slow in many communities.

The principle of a balance of services, taking needs and resources into account, has been quite generally recognized. Only limited application of this principle, however, has been achieved. Some types of services and some agencies receive support far out of proportion to the community need they meet. Frozen patterns of service have made adjustments difficult. More "realistic community planning, with both governmental and voluntary resources being utilized, is essential," the Hollander committee stated. "This planning must be a continuous process in which agency interests and other community interests join in finding the facts of human need, in establishing priorities regarding needs, and in determining the most effective way to organize the services required."⁸ Criteria

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

for determining need and for appraising services, cooperatively formulated and based on experience, must be evolved. The judgment and full cooperation of national agencies, local affiliates, and local and national interagency bodies are needed.

Higher standards of performance constitute an ever recurring problem. Standards have risen in recent years, in most fields of social welfare services. Significant advances have been made in insights and methods. But the general application of these advances has been far too slow. Substandard services and outmoded methods are as yet too widespread. Councils often encounter resistance in their efforts to improve the quality of services. It is sometimes regarded as an infringement of agency prerogatives. But councils and chests must be concerned about the quality of services in a community. It is one of their reasons for existence, and no group can justly claim its share of community resources if it refuses to bring its services, over a period of time, to a reasonable level of effectiveness. The question is not whether the quality of services should be improved, but by whom, and how?

Standard-setting for services and for personnel is a primary responsibility of national agencies; it is also a direct concern of local service agencies and of councils and chests. Many national agencies now formulate standards, after assembling local experience. The application of standards relating to the extent and quality of service is primarily a local responsibility. Some degree of national requirements, for personnel and other basic essentials, aids local units to raise their levels of practice. Local conditions make varying "timetables" useful. The application of standards should be a mutually determined process, with local service agencies, their national organization representatives, and local chest and council leaders participating together.

In some communities, the responsibility of the council and the chest for providing alert leadership for planning and coordinating services, for working with agencies toward progressively more effective services, must be more generally recognized. More funds and better trained interagency personnel are needed in some communities. The role of leadership in cooperative ventures requires unusual insight about persons and groups, skill in understanding a

community and the changing needs of its people, and broad understanding of social work services and processes.

A number of the underlying factors and forces have been suggested in the preceding discussion, but several of them merit further consideration.

Psychological and emotional factors.—Council and chest executives reported that:

Personality conflicts, professional jealousies, feelings of defensiveness and overprotectiveness and inadequacy represented almost twenty per cent of the barriers to co-operation which they listed. Personality conflicts and professional jealousies were also noted as barriers by agency executives, but were considered less important. Considerable insecurity regarding their own positions and the role of their agency was evident in the replies of many workers in both chests and councils and in direct-service agencies . . .

The underlying cause of many of the problems of relationships, between individuals and organizations, can be found in the emotional problems the individuals face. Agency representatives, and chest and council workers, can be alert to act in ways which will not constitute a threat to the security of other workers. They can help build up confidence by commending good workmanship. They can avoid making criticisms or showing displeasure or censure. They can be observant and objective about their own behavior, without becoming unduly introspective. They can avoid prolonged strain and excessive fatigue. Above all, they can cultivate a genuine respect and liking for people in other agencies who have different approaches to community problems than those used by their own agency. Emotional and psychological barriers to relationships cannot, as a general rule, be solved for others in the course of such relationships, but they can be better understood and taken into account.⁹

Organizational problems.—The conflicting organizational demands earlier discussed have their roots in inadequately defined structure, in seeming overlapping of purposes and responsibilities, and in complexity of structure. Sharper definitions of functions of councils and chests, as contrasted with direct-service agencies, are needed. In some communities, planning and coordinating structure has become extremely complicated and cumbersome, resulting in innumerable meetings and other time-consuming activities. "Too little time—too many meetings" was listed more times than any

⁹ Johns and DeMarche, *op. cit.*, pp. 249, 253.

other problem by the 503 agency workers who participated in the recent study mentioned. More discriminating selection of relationships is undoubtedly necessary. Another organizational problem involves chest-council relationships. In some cities, they are separate organizations, though working closely together. In a few cities, one over-all organization with planning and financing sections has been created. The problem of keeping planning coordinate with financing, however, has not been generally solved.

Some of the requirements for planning bodies have been stated as follows: "Structure must be broadly representative. . . . It must avoid the criticism of being a planning agency for vested interest groups. It must be adequately staffed, and its program and vision of social service needs must be broad and progressive."¹⁰

Some of the organizational problems undoubtedly center in the tendency toward rigidity in all social institutions. "Agency-mindedness," "ingrownness," "vested interests," "agency isolationism," are frequently heard terms which suggest one aspect of the problem. Two observations might appropriately be made: (1) All social organizations tend to become less flexible as they achieve strength. Direct-service agencies, councils, and chests are all subject to this influence. Yet social institutions can achieve strength and remain reasonably flexible if their leadership keeps pliant, resilient, and responsive to changing needs. (2) What seems to be absorption in narrow agency interests may in some cases be a struggle with one of the fundamental problems of council-chest agency relationships; the problem of how much independence must be surrendered—in what ways and to what degree a legally independent organization can and should relinquish its freedom to act without consultation and adjust its plans in relation to broader programs. Community organization workers and direct-service agency workers need to understand more about the nature of social institutions.

Understanding of the nature of cooperative ventures and skill in cooperative relationships.—Underneath the "lack of coopera-

¹⁰ Elmer J. Troopman, "The Concern of the Local Council," in *Interrelationships of Local, State and National Planning* (New York: National Social Welfare Assembly, Inc., 1949), p. 3.

tion," "lack of community coordination," and similar problems stated by chest and council executives and by direct-service agency workers undoubtedly lies an inadequate comprehension of what cooperation really is and how cooperative efforts can be made effective. Cooperation implies a "partnership of equals"; it functions on the basis of consent rather than compulsion. Persistent pressures sometimes need to be applied by interagency leaders—and by direct-service agency leaders themselves—if disturbing facts are to be faced realistically and necessary changes effected; but participants must come to accept the necessity for changes, and not be forced against their will to do something which they cannot honestly believe is best for their community. Budget reviews must be conferences rather than inquisitions. Decisions that endure must be based on voluntary participation and mutual agreement. The relation of responsibility and of authority must be understood. "Most of the work of formal organizations is accomplished under responsibility without authority, or in excess of authority, or without reliance upon authority," Chester I. Barnard has written. "Experienced and effective administrators prefer generally not to use authority. . . . wise men prefer to discharge responsibilities with no authority whatever in order to impose complete responsibility." ¹¹

Both community organization workers and direct-service agency workers need skill in cooperative relationships. The most basic skill for community organization workers "is that of working democratically with people in groups. The committee is a key unit of operation in the work of planning and co-ordination of social welfare services. The group conference is another important device. . . . The community organization worker must possess skill in effecting mutually satisfying interpersonal relations . . ." ¹² Skill in fact-finding, in establishing priorities, in organizing and interpreting, is basic. Agency participants need skill in interpreting the objectives and role of their particular groups, in identifying social problems and selecting social goals. They must be able

¹¹ Chester I. Barnard, review, "Bureaucracy in a Democracy" by Charles S. Hyndman, in *American Political Science Review*, XLIV (December, 1950), 1001-2.

¹² Johns and DeMarche, *op. cit.*, p. 260.

to help their groups to identify their interests in the broader social problems and plans and to understand and interpret the role of other groups.

The critical issues which exist between council and chest and direct-service agencies should be a matter of concern to all who are deeply interested in making these basic social services more effective. The issues are serious, but they are not insoluble. Basically, councils and chests and the great variety of direct-service agencies are all concerned with the common welfare, with the amelioration and the elimination of unwholesome social conditions, with the growth and development of persons. Skillful people, with social insight and high motivation, can solve these problems.

Basic Policies and Principles of Public Child Care Services

By MARTHA BRANSCOMBE

IN THE YEAR 1950, the citizens of this country looked back at the achievements since the turn of the century, and projected their vision for children toward the year A.D. 2000. Many of the goals agreed upon in the various states and at the Mid-Century White House Conference have been voiced by each generation in one form or another. Their significance lies in the fact that they are expressed in terms of the conditions of life and their importance for children as this generation understands them.

Of equal significance are the attempts to devise the means of progressive advancement toward the stated objectives. The latter is the more difficult task; for, naturally, the extent of agreement upon the means is more limited since it is influenced by fundamental and superficial differences in thought and opinion not exclusively related to children. Today, it is imperative, however, that we be tough-minded and pragmatic in our thinking regarding the validity and practicability both of the ends we seek and the means we use to attain them. We all recognize the gap between our expressed idealism and what we are actually doing for children, and progress toward bridging that gap calls for reexamination of our conceptual framework.

It is a high tribute to the Child Welfare League of America that it has given national leadership and stimulation to a restatement of the basic principles of child welfare in a contemporary context. It has given forthright recognition to the differences in thought and opinion regarding these principles. These differences give rise to controversies which are beclouding the public understanding and, in certain respects, paralyzing realistic and objective action

designed to extend and develop child welfare services throughout this country.

The League has issued *A Statement of Principles and Policies on Public Child Welfare*,¹ and is at work on a comparable statement relevant to private services. No startling new ideas are set forth in this statement. Rather it crystallizes what appears to be most generally recognized as a sound basis for discharging our social responsibility for child welfare. It can be assumed that this statement represents the lowest common denominator of agreement for the greatest number of people in the field. It is recognized that in an attempt to find a common base some of the most controversial points are not unequivocally stated. Nevertheless, it provides a rostrum for widespread discussion and thought.

Obviously, consideration of the basic principles is not a new venture. However, in a world where the familiar concepts underlying these principles have been effectively challenged and in many areas callously repudiated, it is no longer possible to take them for granted. Hence it is imperative that we more scrupulously examine their meaning, and that we make more exacting tests of their efficacy. This means that the principles of child welfare should be scrutinized in the context of the underlying philosophy and sociopolitical structure of our society. At best it is a thankless task, and perhaps a presumptuous one, to attempt rationally to reduce to a philosophical level those common notions about child welfare that have arisen from the contingent practical needs of our history; for these notions are laden with social, cultural, religious, political, and economic connotations as ambiguous as they are fertile. The most I can attempt is an expression of my own conception of these democratic fundamentals upon which the principles of child welfare should be postulated and a brief discussion of the applications of these concepts in terms of a few of the principles basic to fulfillment of our idealism as historically and currently expressed in our society.

Our first problem is one of definition of terms. The word "philosophy," as here used indicates an attitude or ideological frame of reference which describes how men live. As I understand it, the

¹ New York: Child Welfare League of America, 1950.

democratic philosophy implies those basic tenets which are the core of our social and political life, and which embrace a common human creed—freedom, equality, and the pursuit of happiness—grounded in the primacy of the dignity of man and supremacy of the human spirit. Thus conceived, our democratic philosophy unites citizens who are in fundamental agreement with these basic tenets in the common task of a common life. That task involves primarily the reconciliation of the needs of social life with the urgency of individual desires as a means of assuring the common welfare.

A clear distinction is therefore drawn between the democratic philosophy that lies at the root of the common life of the civil society or body politic which is of a temporal or secular nature, and religious or theological philosophy which embraces the spiritual realm of the church. This difference, based upon the Gospel's distinction between the things that are Caesar's and the things that are God's, in no sense denies the Judaeo-Christian origin of the basic tenets of democracy. The democratic philosophy as expressed in our society and embodied in the political structure of this nation recognizes the mutual freedom of the church and the state, and does not impose unity of religious creed as a prerequisite for citizenship.

The highest principles for our aspirations and the surest foundation to our valuations are given in the Judaeo-Christian religious form. If one looks only at its purely human side, one might agree with Einstein's idea that it simply means "free and responsible development of the individual, so that he may place his powers freely and gladly in the service of mankind." If one looks at the substance rather than the form, these words can be taken to express also the fundamental tenets of democracy. As a matter of historical fact, liberty in the sense of man's spiritual and intellectual freedom and the freedom to pursue his legitimate avocations first entered practical politics in the form of religious toleration. As a doctrine it came to be widely adopted in the seventeenth century, following the Thirty Years' War.

The greatest of the theoretical advocates of liberty in that period was John Locke. While his concepts were by no means original,

we are particularly indebted not only for his philosophy of democracy but also for his detailed development of the theory of empiricism, which affords a valid theoretical foundation for the practical application of democratic concepts. His ideas had strong influence also upon the doctrine of personal liberty, which came to include man's freedom from punishment without due process of law, freedom of speech, and freedom of the press.

Imbued with these conceptions of democratic idealism, our forefathers designed and engineered this nation, using as its bedrock the basic tenets that give paramount value to the dignity and spirit of man. Not only do our basic documents vest political sovereignty in the people, they also meticulously designed the political structure of this nation and its governmental machinery to guarantee perpetual adherence to the fundamental democratic principle that the State or government is the instrument of the people. Despite the increasing complexity of our society the American government will continue to be the instrument of the people and will be continuously responsive to our aspirations for individual freedom—provided every citizen individually and cooperatively fulfills his obligation to society.

Historically, the child has inspired man to the greatest heights of idealism. Moreover, the child as a human personality has achieved a unique status in American society. This achievement has been possible largely because of the fundamentals implicit in our democratic philosophy and specifically enunciated in our legal doctrine and sociopolitical structure.

Under the theory of natural law and historical jurisprudence as adopted and applied in this country from its origin, the sacrosanctity of the family is held inviolate and inviolable. Furthermore, that the child is the hub of the family appears generally characteristic of our culture. The family, therefore, is vested with natural rights and has primary responsibility for the child, and the child has inherent rights as a human being and special privileges as a minor which his family primarily and society secondarily are obligated to guarantee, safeguard, and protect.

Agreement as regards the preeminence of family responsibility and the primacy of the parent-child relation is, I believe, absolute.

But controversy arises the moment we reach the threshold of the home: should we meet the child as he emerges into the wider community, or enter the home in order either to assist the parents more adequately to fulfill their responsibilities or to provide substitute parental care? Nevertheless, from this background we can at least begin at the "point of common convergence," and within a conceptual framework where differences are delineated it may be possible to arrive at generally acceptable practical conclusions or principles of action.

While it is true that man's response to human needs had its origin in individual charity as a part of religion, evidence that our forebears also recognized the people's common responsibility is to be found in the earliest colonial poor relief system later transplanted to practically every state. Hence the concept of governmental responsibility preceded organized charity outside the church. Although a few private orphanages were started early in the nineteenth century, organized private agencies developed largely during the last half of the century and mainly as a result of the humanitarian reactions of individual citizens to the incompetence of poor law officials and the appalling conditions to which the unfortunate recipients of public relief were subjected. In spite of this early recognition of public responsibility, the attitudes of the people and the methods of public administration combined to stigmatize relief and discredit its administration. Nor have we completely discarded these traditional ideas and attitudes.

The distrust of government deep-rooted in the religious background of the seventeenth century and the Revolutionary era released and emphasized the idea that the individual should find his own pathway. And if the essence of our tradition is individualism, it has had at its center the idea of enlightened self-interest and self-help. This led to widespread and profound belief in the doctrine of rugged individualism. So it was that well into the twentieth century our democratic philosophy of individual freedom protected property more than human rights. The idea of live-and-let-live was, in fact, implicit in all facets of our political, economic, and social development until the turn of the century.

In spite of the dominance of these ideas, the pivotal conceptions

of more positive political thought were initiated as early as the Jacksonian period. They are best characterized by the famous dictum of Supreme Court Justice Roger B. Taney in which he declared: "The object and end of all government, is to promote the happiness and prosperity of the community by which it is established; and it can never be assumed that the government intended to diminish its power of accomplishing the end for which it was created."²

Taney's maxim foreshadowed a basic shift in the Jeffersonian theory of negativism, and by 1854 George Bancroft had declared that while *laissez faire* might solve problems of international trade, "the good time is coming, when humanity will recognize all members of its family as alike entitled to its care."

The concept of more positive government responsibility in economic life and in relation to human needs gradually, if painfully, developed in the direction of increasing the nature and scope of public responsibility and broadening its base from local to state jurisdiction. By the 1860s, the basic concept of government responsibility was voiced by Abraham Lincoln in his memorable statement that "the legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot do so well, for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities."

The great conflict during the 1860s regenerated awareness of the human rights and general welfare provisions of the Constitution. It was not until the 1890s, however, that a genuine political effort was made to narrow the gap between democratic idealism and actual conditions of human life. Lester Ward was the first social theorist to point out the inconsistency and insincerity of the artificial European doctrine of *laissez faire* as applied in America. His unrelenting attack paved the way for the formal repudiation of *laissez faire* which was finally fought out in the political arena. It can be argued with fairness that once our economic effort became predominantly industrial, there were too few people who realized that the complexity of relations in our increasingly urban society made it urgent to breathe life into those democratic concepts of the

² Charles River Bridge decision (11 Peters 547).

Constitution by increasing the power of government to protect man against hazards and problems over which he had no control.

It is not necessary to remind you that the expansion of government has not spelled doom for the American way of life. Bear in mind, however, that it has been due both to the unique character of our people and to the influence of the theories of empiricism, evolution, and pragmatism upon our philosophical concepts that valid adaptations to continuous changes have been made while preserving the basic tenets of democracy. Remember also that if our aspirations for children are not empty shibboleths, the guiding principles for their practical application must be cast in the light of our total experience and rooted in the philosophical concepts that have evolved in this century.

The direction which our political concepts have taken was most nearly forecast by the Populists. Under the leadership of Bryan and La Follette, they espoused the adaptation of the constitutional system to the exigencies of a modern society, regulation of the economic structure by the political authority, and development of new techniques of government administration. The Populist ideas spearheaded the progressivism ushered in by Theodore Roosevelt, which climaxed under Woodrow Wilson's New Freedom and Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal. In each succeeding decade of the twentieth century the concepts of social and political responsibility have advanced in the direction of positive public policy.

Significant progress in the direction of the idea of "government in the service of humanity," was achieved almost a decade before the New Deal, and we came nearer to a "planned economy" during the First World War than was ever envisaged even by Lester Ward. With the war over, the people demanded removal of government controls, and prosperity together with rising totalitarianism in Europe led to the insistence that social and economic planning was contrary to the American way of life.

The depression, however, imposed upon government the incapable responsibility for preserving our economy and safeguarding human freedom. Most of us have been directly or indirectly involved in the transition that followed the advent of the New Deal, changing and amplifying patterns and structure of community

services and adding totally new ones in the mechanism of our political structure. Perhaps we will agree that the most important product of the new political realism is a vital apprehension of the interdependence of liberty and security and of social and economic planning as the essence of democracy. With the proclamation that living democracy depends equally upon each of the Four Freedoms, the concept of liberty was expanded to include freedom from fear and freedom from want.

A vital force influencing the changed conditions of life and transition in thought has been the growing body of scientific and technological knowledge. New knowledge and new philosophical concepts have combined to transform our ideas about the needs of children, about individual and social responsibility and social justice as applied to social services. And once again the base of public responsibility has been broadened to include the national government. New public services have developed to which all individuals in need of such services may lay claim as a matter of right.

It must be recognized, however, that there is great variation in respect to the acceptance and application of these new concepts. Likewise, it should be noted that they are still in the process of evolution. While it is generally recognized that a democratic government has the positive responsibility to assure the social well-being and safeguard the rights of its people, the exact nature and scope of services that the government should provide, have not been clearly determined.

Let me emphasize also that the transition of political and social thought in no sense weakens or negates our fundamental concepts and faith in the primary value of, and necessity for, individual initiative and voluntary cooperation in private enterprises in all spheres of human life. We have adhered to the basic principle set forth by Lincoln. The importance of continued application of this principle in the field of child welfare is, I believe, generally accepted. This calls for a dynamic partnership between private and public agencies related to our democratic ideals. Such partnership rests upon a clear understanding not only of current concepts of public responsibility, but of the underlying philosophy, purpose, and potentialities of voluntary agencies as well. This is not simple,

for they are as diverse as the human motivations and interests of their founders, as the faiths that have expressed their values in the purposes they serve, as the communities and special groups to whose needs they have responded, and as the sources from which they derive financial support.

The fact that generalizations about private agencies are unsound as well as impossible emphasizes their characteristic freedom and potential adaptability. Their diversities and special strengths are highly significant in formulating and applying basic principles for child welfare. For these differences among private agencies themselves together with the intrinsic differences between public and private agencies must be clearly recognized in the total pattern of community services which must include all children. These differences and the infinite variations among state and local conditions preclude valid generalizations or fixed formulas that make sharp demarcations between the spheres of public and private agencies.

Although I cannot here elaborate those functions best suited to private agencies, let me emphasize the conviction that their potential freedom and flexibility are their greatest strengths, and that the preservation and creative use of these characteristics will in large measure determine the validity of their claim for voluntary support and their continuation as a vital force in a democratic society. The full utilization of these strengths will obviously depend upon a dynamic sense of purpose on the part of the agencies, and the motivations, intelligence, and objectivity on the part of individual donors or other major sources of support.

The glaring needs of children are a threat to the perpetuation of our way of life. Present realities make expansion and further development of social services for children a compelling necessity. This cannot be done by the agencies alone. It requires the energetic participation of all the citizens jointly in the public and private agencies in a unified approach to planning and in preventing a comprehensive pattern of community services for all children in need of them and designed to bring into the closest relationship health, education, social services, recreation, and all other services for children.

The partnership between public and private agencies should be

characterized by the flexibility and diversity required to meet the particular needs and circumstances of each state and community in the way that at the particular time seems to work best and most effectively to advance our objectives while adhering to the basic principles of child welfare.

It follows from the philosophical concepts herein enunciated that the people have a common responsibility to assist a family within the home or outside the home in such ways as may be necessary to enable parents to discharge their responsibilities and to fulfill society's obligations. Government is the only instrumentality through which all the people can cooperate to carry out this responsibility. Likewise, only a governmental agency can be made accountable to the people for the coverage required to assure provision of whatever social services are needed by any child regardless of race, creed, legal or economic status, and regardless of where he lives, or of any other consideration except the individual child's need. Accordingly, the public agency should see that social services of every type needed for children are available throughout every state and territory. Likewise, where these services cannot be provided, or provided as well, from private resources, the public agency should provide them directly. Such services regardless of the auspices should meet recognized standards. It would be both dangerous and contrary to the democratic concept of equality to postulate basic principles upon an assumed dual standard of services. Furthermore, insistence upon standards together with confidence in professional training and ethics should give added assurance that public child welfare services are provided on a basis that enhances individual freedom and is continuously responsive to community needs.

There are three other aspects of the conceptual framework about which there are both confusion and fundamental differences in our thinking: (1) public policy regarding purchase of care; (2) continuing responsibility of the public agency; and (3) division of public responsibility between the courts and public administrative agencies.

The first of these aspects is specifically related to the long-established principle that public funds should be expended by public agencies in accordance with statutory authority, and a full and complete accounting for all such expenditures should be made to the

people. With accountability for public funds necessarily goes control of expenditures.

The corollary principle that private agencies should be voluntarily supported seems to me equally basic and the lifeblood of the freedom and flexibility of private agencies. The experience in many places in this country and the tragic history of private agencies in Europe support the conviction that not only are public subsidies to private agencies contrary to our democratic concepts of public responsibility and social justice, they vitiate the true purpose, jeopardize the freedom, and paralyze the initiative of private agencies. If private agencies have a significant role in our society, which I profoundly believe they do, and if they are a measure of our democracy, they must retain final responsibility and control of their purpose and program.

Application of these two principles does not, however, preclude public policy permitting the purchase of care or services from a private agency for an individual child for whom the public agency has responsibility either by statutory mandate, judicial determination, or voluntary parental request and whose needs it cannot meet through its own resources. Nor do they preclude joint undertakings on a cooperative basis, as in the case of research, training, and demonstration projects.

"Purchase of care" is frequently confused with "subsidy." As used here, the term "subsidy" applies to any payment of a predetermined, fixed amount that is made to a private agency for public funds either in a lump sum for a specified general purpose or on a per capita basis for each individual child served regardless of the actual cost of care or the nature and quality of service.

The term "purchase of care" here means payments based upon the actual total cost of care of each individual child as determined by sound methods of cost accounting. Practical application of such a policy entails the obligation of careful evaluation of the standards of each agency from which care is purchased in terms of the quality of services and administrative efficiency as related to the actual costs for the type of care given. By this definition, the purchase of care from public funds must be undertaken in accordance with the basic principles of continuing responsibility and accountability.

A public administrative agency by its very nature cannot of its

own volition or independent action divest itself of responsibilities vested in it by statute or other appropriate action. The laws of the nation and of every state provide remedies in case a public body exceeds or fails properly to discharge such responsibilities. It logically follows that if responsibility is established for the care of any child, a public agency cannot terminate that responsibility merely by paying a private agency or individual to provide the services required. Its responsibility is therefore continuing as long as the need exists, or until such time as its responsibility is properly terminated. Termination of responsibility necessarily terminates public financial obligations.

Continuing responsibility in such instances does not imply that the public agency must maintain continuing direct contact with each child through a worker who parallels the worker of the private agency. Such responsibility can be discharged by appropriate arrangements for periodic reporting, staff conferences, continuing joint planning, and any other device that seems necessary in a particular situation. These arrangements should be mutually agreed upon at the time of contracting for the care of each child. This is not a new idea, and experience has shown that it is not only sound policy but a completely practical procedure.

This principle of continuing responsibility as related to the purchase of care is based squarely upon the democratic concept of trusteeship which applies equally to public and private agencies. This concept expresses the positive obligation to account to the source of support for the nature and quality of service as well as the amounts expended for specified purposes. Certainly this should be a guiding principle for any agency in estimating and justifying budgets, seeking financial support from any source, contracting for services, and preparing reports.

This aspect of public expenditures has special significance for private agencies from which care is purchased, for it must carry public control as distinguished from the type of supervisory responsibility that is inherent in the licensing functions.

Consideration of basic principles of child welfare as related to the responsibilities of government obviously includes the courts, since the functions involved in discharging its responsibilities are

of a judicial as well as an administrative nature. The questions regarding the division of responsibility between these two branches of government call for more thorough discussion than is possible here. Certainly in reexamining the basic principles we should bear in mind the theory of separation of powers which is the basis for the structure of American government at all levels; and while American political tradition has jealously preserved this tripartite arrangement, history reflects changes in the concepts of the nature of action required to discharge certain governmental responsibilities. It also reflects something less than a clear-cut distinction between judicial and administrative functions at the local level, particularly in our earlier history. The traditional prestige of the courts often caused the people to vest in them responsibilities now considered to be of an administrative nature. In some instances this happened because the nature of the problem or the remedy required was not at the time fully understood, or there was no appropriate administrative agency, or those which existed were less trusted.

A review of the history of services for children points up the significance of the new conception of justice for children as expressed at the turn of the century in the juvenile court movement. At that time it represented the modern idea of care for children. It made a major contribution in bringing to light the specialized needs of children and in establishing the need for expert services in the diagnosis and treatment of the individual child's problems. At the time the juvenile court idea was developed, the only public administrative "agency" consisted of the poor relief officials. It is, therefore, understandable historically that the courts became one of the first specialized public services for children.

In the past three decades, the development of public child welfare services, together with the recognition of the inherent limitations of the court as a casework agency, has given rise to difficult jurisdictional questions. Today, however, it is essential to recognize the principle established by our tradition that distinguishes between judicial functions which shall be the responsibility of courts of competent jurisdiction and those of an administrative nature which shall be performed by an appropriate public agency. It is clear that legal questions relevant to compulsory commitment or removal of

the child from his parents, and those affecting the status of the child, must be decided by a court.

In the light of our experience, however, it appears sound to hold that we should not continue to expect the court to decide what should be done beyond the legal problem or to provide the service for the child requiring not legal but social or other treatment. It is recognized that for many reasons this principle cannot be immediately applied everywhere. But this does not alter the fact that the principle is sound and that we should move progressively toward further development of public child welfare services adequate to discharge all the administrative responsibilities of government. While emphasizing the distinctive nature of the functions, it is not intended to minimize the importance of close working relationships which are essential if the action of either is fully to achieve the purpose served.

Effective application of many of the basic principles of child welfare calls for statutory revisions and changes in the organization and procedures both of the public administrative agencies and of the courts. Of these, judicial reform is the most difficult and slowest to achieve. It is of unique significance that failure of the judicial system to keep pace with twentieth-century conditions and philosophical changes was the major factor influencing the totally new concept of administrative tribunals and the resulting new types of governmental machinery that have developed in the past two decades.

Recognition of this new concept and the experience with these new types of administrative bodies whose functions have a judicial character, and from which appeal lies to the courts, suggest fertile possibilities for dealing with child welfare matters. Certainly these are not matters that can be dealt with lightly nor would such changes be wise until a more effective administrative structure has been thoroughly established and tested.

Appendix A: Program

GENERAL SESSIONS

General Theme: Building Social Welfare for Democracy

SUNDAY, MAY 13

8:30 P.M.

The Human Aspects of Mobilization

Frank P. Graham, Defense Manpower Administrator, United States Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.

MONDAY, MAY 14

9:15 A.M.—10:45 A.M.

A Citizen's Viewpoint on Social Welfare

Sadie T. M. Alexander, member, Philadelphia Bar, Philadelphia

8:30 P.M.

Fact-finding and Thinking as Tools in Policy-making

Ewan Clague, President, National Conference of Social Work; Commissioner of Labor Statistics, Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 16

9:15 A.M.—10:45 A.M.

The Response of Social Work to the Present Challenge

Joseph P. Anderson, Executive Secretary, American Association of Social Workers, New York

8:30 P.M.

Community Values in Civil Defense

James J. Wadsworth, Deputy Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Washington, D.C.

FRIDAY, MAY 18

11:15 A.M.—12:45 P.M.

The American People in the World Crisis

Stringfellow Barr, President, Foundation for World Government, New York

THE SECTIONS

MONDAY, MAY 14

11:15 A.M.-12:45 P.M.

I. Services to Individuals and Families

Group Meeting 1

Loula Dunn, Director, American Public Welfare Association, Chicago, presiding

Further Needs in Social Security Legislation

1. Furthers Needs in Social Security Legislation in the Field of the Social Insurances

Eveline M. Burns, Professor of Social Work, New York School of Social Work, Columbia University, New York

2. Further Needs in Social Security Legislation in the Field of Public Welfare

John C. Kidneigh, Director, School of Social Work, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis

Group Meeting 2

Conrad Van Hyning, General Director, National Travelers Aid Association, New York, presiding

Skills in Short Contact Services

1. In an Agency Concentrating on Time-limited Services

Natalie Dunbar, Director of Casework, Rhode Island Children's Friend and Service, Providence, R.I.

2. In Relation to an Information and Referral Service

Dorothy Eklund, Assistant Director, Community Information Center, Community Chest and Council of Hennepin Co., Minneapolis

3. In a Public Agency Setting

Louise Diecks, Director, City of Louisville Department of Public Welfare, Louisville, Ky.

Group Meeting 3

Dorothy C. Kahn, Chief, Social Services Section, United Nations, New York, presiding

Prevention and Treatment of Family Desertion

1. From the Viewpoint of the Social Agency

Maurice O. Hunt, Director, State Department of Public Welfare, Indianapolis

2. From the Viewpoint of the Court

Harry L. Eastman, Judge, Juvenile Court, Cuyahoga Co., Cleveland

Group Meeting 4

Lorraine D. Walling, Supervisor of Public Assistance, Denver Bureau of Public Welfare, Denver, presiding

The Use of Psychiatric Services by a Social Casework Agency

1. Gearing Psychiatric Services to the Needs of a Social Casework Agency

Exie E. Welsch, M.D., Payne Whitney Clinic, Cornell School of Medicine, New York

2. Effective Utilization of Psychiatric Consultation Services by a Social Casework Agency
Ralph Ormsby, Executive Director, Family Service of Philadelphia, Philadelphia

II. Services to Groups and Individuals in Groups

Harleigh B. Trecker, Professor of Social Work, School of Social Work, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, presiding

Impact of the Current Emergency on Group Work

Dorothy C. Stratton, Executive Director, Girl Scouts of the United States of America, New York

Discussants:

Elizabeth H. Ross, Fact-finding Staff, White House Conference, Federal Security Agency, Washington, D.C.

Sanford Solender, Director, Jewish Center Division, National Jewish Welfare Board, New York

Harry Serotkin, Secretary, Group Work Division, Health and Welfare Federation of Allegheny County, Pittsburgh

III. Services to Agencies and Communities

Fred K. Hoehler, Director, State Department of Public Welfare, Springfield, Ill., presiding

International Relationships

What Is the Common Core of Social Work in All Countries?

Donald S. Howard, Dean, School of Social Welfare, University of California at Los Angeles

2:00 P.M.-3:30 P.M.

I. Services to Individuals and Families

Group Meeting 1

Fred K. Hoehler, Director, State Department of Public Welfare, Springfield, Ill., presiding

The Impact of the Recent Expansion of OASI

1. The Effect of the Recent Expansion of OASI upon Public Assistance Case Loads and Expenditures

Jane M. Hoey, Director, Bureau of Public Assistance, Social Security Administration, Federal Security Agency, Washington, D.C.

2. The Effect of the Recent Expansion of OASI upon Services to OASI Recipients by Public Agencies

Jeanne Jewett, Assistant Administrator, Oregon Public Welfare Commission, Portland, Oreg.

3. The Effect of the Recent Expansion of OASI upon Services to OASI Recipients by Private Agencies

William T. Kirk, Director, Special Services Division, Community Service Society of New York, New York

Group Meeting 2

Dorothy Hankins, Casework Supervisor, Philadelphia Child Guidance Clinic, Philadelphia, presiding

Current Emphases in Casework in Rural Areas

1. Current Emphases in Casework in Voluntary Agencies Functioning in Rural Areas
Marie Scott, Executive Director, Kansas Children's Service League, Topeka, Kans.
2. Current Emphases in Casework in Public Agencies Functioning in Rural Areas
Mary B. Calvert, Associate Professor, School of Social Work, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.

Group Meeting 3

Josephine C. Brown, Assistant Professor of Social Work, Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C., presiding

Current Emphases in Casework under Religious Auspices

1. Integration of Casework and Other Programs under Religious Auspices
Henry J. Whiting, Executive Secretary, Lutheran Welfare Society, Minneapolis
2. Developments in Casework Programs under Religious Auspices
Katharine E. Griffith, Executive Secretary, Diocesan Bureau of Social Service, Hartford, Conn.

Group Meeting 4

John E. Dula, Staff Surveyor, Child Welfare League of America, New York, presiding

Current Emphases in Casework in Institutions for Delinquents: Casework Services Today in Institutions for Delinquents

Norman Lourie, Hawthorne-Cedar Knolls School of Jewish Board of Guardians, Hawthorne, N.Y.

Discussants:

Alan Keith-Lucas, Lecturer in Social Work, School of Social Work, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C.

Hortense S. Cochrane, Professor of Social Work, Atlanta University School of Social Work, Atlanta, Ga.

Group Meeting 5

Hazel M. Halloran, Director of Social Service, St. Vincent's Hospital, New York, presiding

Current Emphases in Casework in Public Health and Hospital Settings

1. Casework Services Today in a Public Health Setting
Helene Sensenich Lit, Regional Medical Social Consultant, Children's Bureau, Social Security Administration, Federal Security Agency, Washington, D.C.
2. Casework Services Today in a Hospital Setting
Mary L. Hemmy, Director, Social Service Department, Washington University Clinics and Allied Hospital, St. Louis

Group Meeting 6

Dorothea Dolan, Psychiatric Social Work Consultant, Public Health Service, Federal Security Agency, Chicago, presiding

Current Emphases in Casework in a Psychiatric Setting: Casework Services Today in a Psychiatric Setting

M. J. Rockmore, Director, Social Service Treatment Center, New York
Psychoanalytic Institute, New York

Discussants:

Leon Lucas, Supervisor, Field Work Unit, New York School of Social
Work, Columbia University, New York
Lillian Snyder, Chief Social Worker, United States Marine Hospital,
Baltimore

Group Meeting 7

Elizabeth P. Rice, Assistant Professor of Medical Social Work, School of
Public Health, Harvard University, Boston, presiding

**Development of Medical Care Programs to Meet Needs of Individuals and
Families as Illustrated by:**

1. A Crippled Children's Program

Herbert R. Kobes, M.D., Director, Division of Services for Crippled
Children, University of Illinois, Springfield, Ill.

2. A Home Care Program

Virginia Insley, Chief, Social Service Section, Richmond City Health
Department, Richmond, Va.

II. Services to Groups and Individuals in Groups

Group Meeting 1

Saul Bernstein, Professor of Group Work, Boston University School of
Social Work, Boston, presiding

**Utilizing New Knowledge in Work with Groups: the Group Contagion Study
and Its Implication for Group Work**

Fritz Redl, Professor of Social Work, School of Social Work, Wayne Uni-
versity, Detroit

Discussants:

Martin Gula, Consultant on Group Care, Division of Social Service, Chil-
dren's Bureau, Social Security Administration, Federal Security Agency,
Washington, D.C.

Miriam R. Ephraim, Jewish Center Division, National Jewish Welfare
Board, New York

Group Meeting 2

Clyde E. Murray, Executive Director, Manhattanville Neighborhood
Center, New York, presiding

**Utilizing New Knowledge about Individual Behavior in Work with Groups in
the Leisure-time Setting**

Alexander R. Martin, Chairman, Committee on Leisure-time Activity,
American Psychiatric Association, New York

Discussants:

Rudolph Wittenberg, New School for Social Research, New York

Helen Phillips, Associate Professor of Group Work, School of Social
Work, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia

Group Meeting 3

Mrs. T. O. Wedel, Washington, D.C., presiding

Utilizing New Knowledge about Group Behavior

Ronald Lippitt, Professor of Sociology and Psychology and Program Director, Research Center for Group Dynamics, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Discussants:

Ira L. Gibbons, Assistant Professor, School of Social Work, Howard University, Washington, D.C.

Dorothy I. Height, staff member, National Board, Y.W.C.A., New York

III. Services to Agencies and Communities**Group Meeting 1**

Leonard W. Mayo, Director, Association for Aid of Crippled Children, New York, presiding

Local Community Planning**Variant Cultural Value Orientations in American Society**

Florence Rockwood Kluckhohn, Lecturer, Department of Social Relations, and Research Associate, Laboratory of Social Relations, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Panel Discussion

Chairman: Leonard W. Mayo

Participants:

Helen D. Green, Associate Professor, School of Social Work, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh

Merrill F. Krughoff, Director, Health and Welfare Planning Department, Community Chests and Councils of America, New York

Group Meeting 2 (Joint Session with the Committee on Public Relations)

Charles E. Hendry, Professor of Social Work, School of Social Work, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada, presiding

Panel Discussion: Building a Partnership between Professionals and the Public in the Field of Social Welfare**Participants:**

Rev. Almon R. Pepper, Director, Department of Christian Social Relations, National Council of Protestant Episcopal Churches, New York

Thomas McCullough, Director of Agency Operations, Community Chest of Philadelphia and Vicinity, Philadelphia

Edward D. Lynde, Executive Secretary, Welfare Federation of Cleveland, Cleveland

Raymond F. Clapp, Principal Assistant Director, Public Welfare, Board of Public Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Daniel R. Elliott, Associate Executive Director, Welfare Federation of Cleveland, Cleveland

John Foley, Director, Merrick House, Cleveland

4:00 P.M.—5:30 P.M.

Committee on Professional Education**Panel Discussion: Study of Social Work Education—Its Significance for the Whole Field of Social Work**

Chairman: Nathan E. Cohen, Professor of Social Work, New York School of Social Work, Columbia University, New York

Participants:

Joseph P. Anderson, Executive Secretary, American Association of Social Workers, New York

Harriet M. Bartlett, Professor, Simmons College School of Social Work, Boston; Chairman, Study Committee, National Council on Social Work Education

Eileen Blackey, Director of Training, Social Service Division, Veterans Administration, Washington, D.C.

Ernest B. Harper, Head, Department of Social Service, Michigan State College, East Lansing, Mich.

Jane Hoey, Director, Bureau of Public Assistance, Social Security Administration, Federal Security Agency, Washington, D.C.

Mrs. Victor Shaw, Past President, West Virginia Conference of Social Work, Fairmont, W. Va.

Helen Wright, Dean, School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago, Chicago

Committee on Public Relations

(Joint Session with Section II and Section III)

Bernard A. Roloff, Public Relations Director, Community Fund of Chicago and Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago, presiding

How Does the Public Look upon Social Agencies in Time of Defense Mobilization and Preparation for War?

Robert Bondy, Director, National Social Welfare Assembly, New York

Discussant:

Sallie E. Bright, Executive Director, National Publicity Council for Health and Welfare Services, New York

Committee on Social Research and Social Studies

Group Meeting 1

Charles E. Hendry, Professor of Social Work, School of Social Work, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada, presiding

The Common Ground of Interest of Agencies, Citizens, and Social Planning Bodies in Community Studies

R. Clyde White, Professor of Social Work, School of Applied Social Sciences, Western Reserve University, Cleveland

Discussants:

Frederick I. Daniels, Executive Director, Brooklyn Bureau of Social Service and Children's Aid Society, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Tanner Duckrey, Assistant to Board of Superintendents, Board of Education, Philadelphia

Isabel Kennedy, Executive Secretary, Health and Welfare Federation of Allegheny County, Pittsburgh

Group Meeting 2

Clark Mock, Executive Secretary, Family and Children's Society, Baltimore, presiding

Accounting for Agency Services

1. Service Accounting and Its Role in the Community Research Program
Esther M. Moore, Research Director, Community Chests and Councils of America, New York
2. Unmet Needs in Service Accounting for Community Research Purposes
John B. Dawson, Executive Director, Health and Welfare Council of Philadelphia, Philadelphia

Discussant:

Edward E. Schwartz, Chief, Program Research Branch, Children's Bureau, Social Security Administration, Federal Security Agency, Washington, D.C.

Group Meeting 3

Walter Barlow, Opinion Research Corp., Princeton, N.J., presiding
Modern Methods of Measuring Attitudes, Opinions, and Judgments of the Public and Their Application to the Social Welfare Field

Paper prepared by Rensis Likert, Director, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich., and Ronald Lippitt, Program Director, Research Center for Group Dynamics, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. Paper presented by Ronald Lippitt

Discussants:

Richard P. Overmyer, Director of Public Relations, Welfare Federation of Cleveland, Cleveland

John G. Hill, Research Director, Health and Welfare Council of Philadelphia, Philadelphia

Robert K. Taylor, Executive Director, Community Planning Council of Metropolitan Atlanta, Atlanta, Ga.

4:00 P.M.-5:30 P.M.

Group Meeting 4

Helen L. Witmer, Professor of Social Work, School of Social Welfare, University of California at Los Angeles, presiding

Sampling of Case Loads for Research Studies in a Social Agency as a Way of Obtaining Information with a Limited Degree of Effort

1. Dealing with Large Populations

Paper prepared by Anne E. Geddes, Chief, Division of Program Statistics and Analysis, Bureau of Public Assistance, Social Security Administration, Federal Security Agency, Washington, D.C., and Walter M. Perkins, Analytical Statistician, Division of Program, Statistics, and Analysis, Bureau of Public Assistance, Social Security Administration, Federal Security Agency, Washington, D.C. Paper presented by Anne E. Geddes

2. Dealing with Small Caseloads

Paper prepared by Bertram J. Black, Assistant Executive Director, Jewish Board of Guardians, New York and Charles P. Gershenson, Research Associate, Psychological Research Institute, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York. Paper presented by Bertram J. Black

10:00 P.M.

Reception for newcomers

WEDNESDAY, MAY 16

11:15 A.M.—12:45 P.M.

I. Services to Individuals and Families

Group Meeting 1

Clark W. Blackburn, Executive Secretary, Family and Children's Service, Minneapolis, presiding

Sound Administration

1. In a Multiple-function Agency

Lillie H. Nairne, Director, Orleans Parish Department of Public Welfare, New Orleans

2. In a Single-function Agency

Dorothea P. Coe, Executive Director, Spence-Chapin Adoption Service, New York

Group Meeting 2

E. B. Whitten, Executive Director, National Rehabilitation Association, Washington, D.C., presiding

Services to the Disabled

1. Experience in Administering the New Public Assistance Category

Edith G. Ross, Director of Local Welfare Services, State Department of Public Welfare, Baton Rouge, La.

2. Integration of Special Services to the Disabled

Eugene J. Taylor, editorial staff, *New York Times*; Assistant Professor of Clinical Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, New York University, Bellevue Medical Center, New York; New York City field representative, National Society for Crippled Children and Adults

Group Meeting 3

Perry B. Hall, Executive Secretary, Family and Children's Service, Pittsburgh, presiding

Homemaker Service—a Growing Field

1. Homemaker Service as a Method of Serving Children

Margaret Fitzsimmons, Director of Casework, Family and Children's Service, Minneapolis

2. Homemaker Service for Older Persons

Frances Preston, Director, Home Economics Department, Family Service Association of Cleveland, Cleveland

Group Meeting 4

Marietta Stevenson, Director, School of Social Service Administration, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill., presiding

Child Welfare Services in Public Agencies

1. Developments in Services to Children by State Public Welfare Agencies

Mildred Arnold, Director, Division of Social Services, Children's Bureau, Social Security Administration, Federal Security Agency, Washington, D.C.

2. Developments in Services to Children by Local Public Welfare Agencies

Doris Bender, Director, Mobile Co. Department of Public Welfare, Mobile, Ala.

II. Services to Groups and Individuals in Groups

Group Meeting 1

Catherine C. Hiatt, Director, Conference Service, Welfare Council of New York City, New York, presiding

Frontiers in Group Work Practice—Analyses of Front-line Experiences: Services to Individuals within a Group Work Setting

Rosemary Reynolds, Associate District Secretary, Family Service, Chelsea-Lowell District, Community Service Society of New York, New York

Discussants:

Hazel Osborn, Supervisor, Student Training Project, Bronx House, New York

Lester Scheaffer, Executive Director, North East Neighborhood House, Minneapolis

Group Meeting 2

Jack Stumpf, Consultant, Education-Recreation Division, Health and Welfare Council, Philadelphia, presiding

Social Group Work with Hard-to-reach Groups

Estelle Alston, Supervisor, Special Service Unit, Los Angeles Youth Project at All Nation's Foundation, Los Angeles

Discussants:

James McCarthy, New York City Youth Board, New York

Helen Sheeley, State Training School for Girls, Trenton, N.J.

Group Meeting 3

Jean Maxwell, National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, New York, presiding

The Place of the Sectarian Agency in Services to Groups

Nathan E. Cohen, Professor of Social Work, New York School of Social Work, Columbia University, New York

Discussants:

Samuel Levine, General Director, Jewish Community Centers of Chicago, Chicago

Sister Immaculate, Our Lady of the Lake College, San Antonio, Texas

Rose Mae Catchings, Associate Director, Department of Social Welfare, Washington Federation of Churches, Washington, D.C.

Group Meeting 4

Florence Ray, Secretary, Group Work Council, Welfare Federation of Cleveland, Cleveland, presiding

Current Trends in Camping

1. From the Standpoint of Intercultural Relations

Margaret Hartford, Assistant Professor of Group Work, School of Applied Social Sciences, Western Reserve University, Cleveland

2. From the Standpoint of Social Group Work Principles

Nora M. Kelly, Director, Girls Camp, Community Service Society of New York, New York

3. From the Standpoint of Individualization

William Gunn, Director, Camp Raritan, Life Camps, New York

Group Meeting 5

Panel Discussion: Values and Limitations in Decentralized Programs in Group Work

Chairman: Catherine V. Richards, Executive Director, Girl Scouts of Metropolitan Detroit, Detroit

Participants:

Howard Gibbs, Program and Personnel Service, Boys Clubs of America, New York

Murray Raim, Supervisor, Shaker-Lee Branch, Jewish Community Centers of Cleveland, Cleveland

Peter J. Cremins, House Director, Southwark House, United Neighbors Association, Philadelphia

Briseis Teall, Executive Director, Inter-Association Committee, Y.W.C.A. of Brooklyn, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Group Meeting 6

Alan F. Klein, Associate Professor, School of Social Work, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada, presiding

Services to Groups in Rural Settings: Social Group Work in Rural Settings

Nancy Jaggard, Group Work Consultant, Child Welfare Services, State Department of Public Welfare, Denver

Discussant:

Robert Class, Assistant Professor of Social Work, University of Connecticut, Hartford, Conn.

III. Services to Agencies and Communities

Robert E. Bondy, Director, National Social Welfare Assembly, New York, presiding

Social Aspects of Economic Development under the Point Four Program

E. Reesman Fryer, Chief of Manpower, Health and Education Division, Technical Cooperation Administration, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

2:00 P.M.-3:30 P.M.

I. Services to Individuals and Families

Group Meeting 1

Ellen Winston, Commissioner, State Board of Public Welfare, Raleigh, N.C., presiding

Constructive Aspects of Public Assistance

1. Constructive Aspects of Public Assistance for Children

Crystal M. Potter, Deputy Commissioner, New York City Department of Welfare, New York

Amelia Igel, Director, Bureau of Child Welfare, New York City Department of Welfare, New York

2. Constructive Aspects of Public Assistance for the Disabled
William L. Painter, Director, Division of General Welfare, State Department of Welfare and Institutions, Richmond, Va.
3. Constructive Aspects of Public Assistance for the Aged
Elmer V. Andrews, Deputy Commissioner for Welfare, State Department of Institutions and Agencies, Trenton, N.J.

Group Meeting 2

Lora Lee Pederson, Director, School of Social Work, University of Texas, Austin, Texas, presiding

Selected Aspects of Recording

1. Modern Casework Recording: Integrating Casework and Supervision through Case Records
Marguerite Munro, Supervisor, Family and Children's Division, Brooklyn Bureau of Social Service and Children's Aid Society, Brooklyn, N.Y.
2. Administrative Aspects of Recording
Leora Connor, Executive Secretary, Family Service Agency, Memphis, Tenn.

Group Meeting 3

Abraham Stone, M.D., Medical Director, Marriage Consultation Center, Community Church, New York, presiding

Marital Counseling

1. Marital Counseling in a Marriage Counseling Clinic
Emily H. Mudd, Executive Director, Marriage Council of Philadelphia, Philadelphia
2. Marital Counseling in a Family Service Agency
Eleanor A. Moore, Director of Casework Services, Family Service Society, New Haven, Conn.
3. Marital Counseling under Religious Auspices
Rev. Thomas J. Bigham, Jr., General Theological Seminary, New York

Group Meeting 4

Morris Zelditch, Director, Social Planning Department, Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, New York, presiding

The Values of Differentiated and Undifferentiated Case Loads

1. An Evaluation of Differentiated Case Loads
Margaret G. Muller, Children's Services Consultant, Child and Family Agency, Toledo, Ohio
2. An Evaluation of Undifferentiated Case Loads
Kathryn Ellis, Director, Child and Family Service, Norfolk, Va.

Group Meeting 5

Martha Branscombe, Director, Elizabeth McCormick Memorial Fund, Chicago, presiding

Effects of Mobilization on Family Life with Special Reference to:

1. Long-time Separation
Edna Mattox, Assistant Director, Services to Armed Forces and Veterans, for Home Service Southeastern Area, American National Red Cross, Atlanta, Ga.

2. Employment of Women

Frieda S. Miller, Director, Women's Bureau, United States Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.

3. Day Care

Dorothy H. Beers, Consultant, Child Welfare League of America, New York

II. Services to Groups and Individuals in Groups

Clara Kaiser, Professor of Social Work, New York School of Social Work, Columbia University, New York, presiding

Group Factors in World Reconstruction

Charles E. Hendry, Professor of Social Work, School of Social Work, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada

Panel Discussion

Chairman: Clara Kaiser

Participants:

Dorothea F. Sullivan, Administrative Officer, Group Work Sequence, National Catholic School of Social Service, Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.

Gisela Konopka, Associate Professor of Social Work, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis

Dorothea Spellman, Professor of Social Work, School of Social Work, University of Denver, Denver
Philip Ryan, Chief of Mission, International Refugee Organization, Germany

III. Services to Agencies and Communities

Group Meeting 1

Melvin A. Glasser, Associate Chief, Children's Bureau, Social Security Administration, Federal Security Agency, Washington, D.C., presiding

Services Working Together for Children and Youth—Implications of the Mid-century White House Conference for Community Planning and Action

1. The Role of Education in Community Planning for Children and Youth
Arno A. Bellack, Executive Secretary, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, National Education Association

2. The Role of Health Services in Community Planning for Children and Youth

Samuel M. Wishik, M.D., Director, Bureau of Child Health, New York City Department of Health, New York

3. The Role of Social Welfare in Community Planning for Children and Youth

Elizabeth H. Ross, Consultant, National Institutes of Health, United States Public Health Service, Federal Security Agency, Washington, D.C.

Group Meeting 2

Ernest F. Witte, Executive Secretary, Health and Welfare Council, Seattle, presiding

Teamwork in Community Planning for the Aging

1. Getting the Facts

- Joseph Zarefsky, Research Director, Community Chest and Council of Houston and Harris County, Houston, Texas
2. Rallying Community Forces
Lucia J. Bing, Secretary, Committee on Older Persons, Welfare Federation of Cleveland, Cleveland
 3. The State-wide Approach to Planning
Lowell Iberg, Associate Executive Director, State Charities Aid Association, New York
 4. National Resources for Local Planning
Geneva Mathiasen, Special Assistant to the National Committee on the Aging, National Social Welfare Assembly, New York

Group Meeting 3

Sidney Hollander, board member, Community Chests and Councils of America, Baltimore, presiding

Current Critical Issues in Council-Agency Relationships

Ray Johns, General Secretary, Y.M.C.A., Boston

Discussants:

Frank J. Hertel, General Director, Family Service Association of America, New York

Isabel P. Kennedy, Executive Secretary, Health and Welfare Federation of Allegheny County, Pittsburgh

Group Meeting 4

Stanton Balfour, Pittsburgh Foundation, Pittsburgh, presiding

Solving Health and Welfare Problems through Neighborhood Participation

Violet M. Sieder, Associate Director, Health and Welfare Planning Department, Community Chests and Councils of America, New York

Discussants:

Charles W. White, Assistant Law Director, City of Cleveland

John McDowell, Executive Director, National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, New York

Helen Fritz, Management Adviser in Community Activities and Tenant Relations, Chicago Housing Authority, Chicago

Alex Barbour, Secretary-Treasurer, Wayne Co., C.I.O. Council, Detroit; board member, Council of Social Agencies, Detroit

4:00 P.M.-5:30 P.M.

Annual Business Meeting

FRIDAY, MAY 18

9:15 A.M.-10:45 A.M.

Committee on Professional Education

Emil M. Sunley, Director, School of Social Work, University of Denver, Denver, presiding

Study of Social Work Education

1. Its Significance for the Graduate School of Social Work
Helen Wright, Dean, School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago, Chicago
2. Its Significance for the Undergraduate Educational Institutions
Ernest B. Harper, Head, Department of Social Service, Michigan State College, East Lansing, Mich.

Committee on Public Relations

Group Meeting 1

James E. Scull, Public Relations Director, Family Service Association of America, New York, presiding

What Shall Casework Say to the Public in These Times?

Eva Burmeister, Executive Secretary, Lakeside Children's Home, Milwaukee. Paper read by Ellen Gibson, *Milwaukee Journal*.

Group Meeting 2

Richard P. Overmyer, Director of Public Relations, Welfare Federation of Cleveland, Cleveland, presiding

How Can We Interpret Group Work Services to the Public in These Times?

Mrs. William C. Treuhaft, Chairman, Council's Committee on New and Unmet Needs; member, Welfare Federation Board of Trustees, Cleveland; former Chairman, Group Work Council, Welfare Federation of Cleveland, Cleveland

Panel Participants:

Leta H. Galpin, Teen-age Program Staff, Community Division, National Board of Y.W.C.A., New York

Ann L. New, Director of Public Information, Girl Scouts of the United States of America, New York

John McDowell, Executive Director, National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, New York

Bernard Postal, Director, Bureau of Public Information, National Jewish Welfare Board, New York

Wilber I. Newstetter, Dean, School of Social Work, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh

Group Meeting 3

Rosemary Morrissey, Public Relations Counsel, Orleans Parish Department of Public Welfare, New Orleans, presiding

How Can We Justify Public Assistance to the Public in These Times?

Thomas J. S. Waxter, Director, Department of Public Welfare, Baltimore

Committee on Social Research and Social Studies

David G. French, Assistant Executive Secretary, American Association of Social Workers, New York, presiding

Our Past and What Must Be Our Future in Use of Research in Social Welfare

Philip Klein, Professor of Social Work, New York School of Social Work, Columbia University, New York

ASSOCIATE AND SPECIAL GROUPS

Joint Meetings

The programs below are general interest meetings jointly planned and jointly sponsored by thirty-one of the Associate and Special Groups. This is a new plan tried on an experimental basis for the 1951 Annual Meeting. The list of cooperating Groups follows:

Advisory Committee on Citizen Participation
 American Association of Group Workers
 American Association of Medical Social Workers
 American Cancer Society
 American Foundation for the Blind
 American Home Economics Association, Social Welfare and Public Health Department
 American Legion National Child Welfare Division
 American National Red Cross
 Association of State Conference Secretaries
 Child Welfare League of America
 Church Conference of Social Work
 Committee on Social Service Exchange, Community Chests and Councils of America
 Community and Social Agency Employees Union, C.I.O.
 Community Chests and Councils of America
 Episcopal Service for Youth
 Family Service Association of America
 Goodwill Industries of America
 International Conference of Social Work
 National Association of School Social Workers
 National Board, Y.W.C.A.'s
 National Child Labor Committee
 National Committee on Sheltered Workshops and Homebound Programs
 National Council, Y.M.C.A.'s
 National Council Protestant Episcopal Church, Department of Christian Social Relations
 National Probation and Parole Association
 National Social Welfare Assembly
 National Society for Crippled Children and Adults
 National Travelers Aid Association
 National Tuberculosis Association
 National Urban League
 Planned Parenthood Federation of America

The following persons were responsible for planning and organizing these joint meetings:

Lyman Ford, Associate Executive Director, Community Chests and Councils of America, New York, Chairman
 Gordon Berg, Community Chests and Councils of America, New York

- Frank J. Hertel, General Director, Family Service Association of America, New York
- Elizabeth Maloney, Assistant Director, Department for the Handicapped, Brooklyn Bureau of Social Service, Brooklyn, N.Y.
- Wilbur F. Maxwell, Labor Participation Department, Community Chests and Councils of America, New York
- Esther M. Moore, Director, Department of Statistics and Research, Community Chests and Councils of America, New York
- John Moore, Executive Director, United Community Defense Services
- Louise N. Mumm, National Social Welfare Assembly, New York
- George Rabinoff, National Social Welfare Assembly, New York
- Will C. Turnbladh, Executive Director, National Probation and Parole Association, New York
- Robert S. Wilson, National Director, Services to the Armed Forces and Veterans, American National Red Cross, Washington, D.C.

TUESDAY, MAY 15

9:15 A.M.—10:45 A.M.

Organized Health and Welfare Services and Civil Defense

Alden E. Bevier, Director, Defense Welfare Services, New York State Department of Social Welfare; New York State Civil Defense Commission, presiding

The Role of Organized Welfare and Health Services in Civil Defense

1. From the Point of View of the Federal Civil Defense Administration
Ray T. Schaeffer, Director, Emergency Welfare Services, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Washington, D.C.
2. From the Point of View of the State Office of Civil Defense
Newton D. Holcomb, Director, Evacuation and Welfare Services, California Office of Civil Defense, Sacramento, Calif.
3. From the Point of View of the Individual and the Organized Groups
Mrs. C. H. L. Pennock, Chairman, Advisory Committee on Citizen Participation of Community Chests and Councils of America and the National Social Welfare Assembly, Poughkeepsie, N.Y.

Basic Principles of Public and Private Child Care

Marion Hathway, Professor of Public Welfare, School of Social Work, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, presiding

Basic Policies and Principles of Public Child Care Services

Martha Branscombe, Director, Elizabeth McCormick Memorial Fund, Chicago

Discussants:

- Frances Davis, Director, Child Welfare Division, State Department of Social Service, Jacksonville, Fla.
- William D. Schmidt, Executive Director, Children's Services, Cleveland
- Rt. Rev. Msgr. John J. Butler, President, Catholic Charities of St. Louis, Department of Children, St. Louis

The Role of the Public and Voluntary Agency in Rehabilitation

M. Roberta Townsend, Director of Homework and Survey Department, National Industries for the Blind, New York, presiding

The Role of the Public and Voluntary Agency in Rehabilitation

1. The Federal Agency Looks at Its Rehabilitation Program, Both Present and Future

Mary E. Switzer, Director, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Federal Security Agency, Washington, D.C.

2. Private Agency Focus in Rehabilitation

Lawrence Linck, Executive Director, National Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Chicago

Discussants:

Morton Seidenfeld, National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, New York

A. L. Chapman, M.D., Regional Medical Director, United States Public Health Service, Federal Security Agency, Washington, D.C.

Public and Private Services in the Field of Delinquency

Will C. Turnblad, Executive Director, National Probation and Parole Association, New York, presiding

1. A Modern Foundation for the Casework Services of a Community

Ernest F. Witte, Executive Secretary, Seattle Health and Welfare Council, Seattle

2. Limitation of the "Traditional" Approach to Delinquency

Edwin J. Lukas, Director, Civil Rights Department, American Jewish Committee; former Executive Director, Society for the Prevention of Crime, New York

11:15 A.M.—12:45 P.M.

Organized Health and Welfare Services and Civil Defense (Continuation of 9:15 A.M. Meeting)

The Role of Organized Welfare and Health Services in Civil Defense, from the Point of View of the Community

Representatives of Office of Civil Defense, Albany Co., N.Y.

The Public Schools and Community Health, Welfare, and Recreation Services

Marjorie Manning, Council of Social Agencies, Cincinnati, presiding

How Can the Public Schools and Community Agencies Work Together More Effectively? The School's Intramural Health, Welfare, and Recreation Services

Robert H. Black, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Hartford Board of Education, Hartford, Conn.

Discussants:

1. How Can Agencies Help the Schools in Serving Children?

Josephine Parker, Director, Family Service Division, Neighborhood League, Wayne, Pa.

2. How Can We Improve Mutual Understanding?

Opal Boston, Supervisor, Students in Training, Department of Social Service and Special Education, Indianapolis public schools, Indianapolis

The Midcentury Conference on Children and Youth

Leonard W. Mayo, Director, Association for the Aid of Crippled Children, New York, presiding

The Midcentury Conference on Children and Youth

1. What Do Children Need?

Ira De A. Reid, Professor of Sociology, Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.

2. The Challenge of Our Times

Katharine F. Lenroot, Chief, Children's Bureau, Social Security Administration, Federal Security Agency, Washington, D.C.

The Use of Collateral Information by, and Consultation among Social Caseworkers

Daniel R. Elliott, Associate Executive Secretary, Welfare Federation of Cleveland, Cleveland, presiding

The Values and Limitations of Collateral Information for Caseworkers

Helen Harris Perlman, Associate Professor, School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago, Chicago

Discussants:

1. From the Standpoint of Family Casework with Emphasis on Cooperative Voluntary Service to the Client

Marguerite Meyer, Case Consultant, Family Society of Greater Boston, Boston

2. From the Standpoint of Casework in Which Greater Responsibility and Authority are Carried by the Agency

Helen C. Hubbell, Chief, Division of Rural Child Welfare, State Department of Welfare, Harrisburg, Pa.

3. From the Standpoint of Regional and Intercity Exchange of Information among Caseworkers

Dorothy Sills, Director of Field Services, National Travelers Aid Association, New York

2:00 P.M.-3:30 P.M.

Impact of the Mobilization for Defense on Organized Health, Welfare and Recreation Services

Mrs. Henry A. Ingraham, Chairman, Executive Committee, National Social Welfare Assembly, New York, presiding

Special Needs of Members of the Armed Forces

J. Thomas Schneider, Chairman, Personal Policy Board

Panel Participants:

Edwin E. Bond, Executive Director, United Service Organizations, New York

Dewitt C. Smith, Vice President for Social Welfare Services, American National Red Cross, Washington, D.C.

R. L. Sheetz, Executive Director, Norfolk Community Chest, Norfolk, Va.

Fees for Social Welfare Services

Nathan Cohen, Professor of Social Work, New York School of Social Work, Columbia University, New York, presiding

Fees for Social Welfare Services

1. Basic Philosophy on Fee Payments for Social Welfare Services
Russell W. Leedy, Executive Secretary, Community Corporation, Youngstown, Ohio
2. The Basis for Determining a Client's Ability to Pay Fees
Frances Preston, Director, Home Economics Department, Family Service Association of Cleveland, Cleveland

Panel Discussion

Chairman: Nathan Cohen

Participants:

John A. Ledlie, National Council, Y.M.C.A.'s, New York
 Sylvia B. Anderson, American Home Economics Association, New York
 Jean Kallenberg, Family Service Association of America, New York
 Helen Rowe, Camp Fire Girls, New York
 Henrietta L. Gordon, Child Welfare League of America, New York
 Esther M. Moore, Community Chests and Councils of America, New York

Organized Labor and Community Health, Welfare and Recreation

Sidney Hollander, Baltimore, presiding

Labor Looks at Health and Welfare Services

1. Should Working People Help to Plan and Operate Services?
John C. Pierce, C.I.O. Staff Associate, Labor Participation Department, Community Chests and Councils of America, New York
2. What Can Organized Labor Do?
Joseph V. Tobin, A.F.L. Associate Director, Labor Participation Department, Community Chests and Councils of America, New York

Discussants:

Frank J. Hertel, General Director, Family Service Association of America, New York
 Elizabeth Wickenden, Washington representative, American Public Welfare Association, Washington, D.C.

4:00 P.M.-5:30 P.M.

Impact of the Mobilization for Defense on Organized Health, Welfare, and Recreation Services (Continuation of 2:00 P.M. Meeting)

George Quinn, Chairman, Civilian Mobilization Committee, Cleveland, presiding

Special Needs of Civilians in Congested Communities and Affected Groups

James B. Carey, Secretary-Treasurer, C.I.O.; President, International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, C.I.O., Washington, D.C.

Panel Participants:

Dean Snyder, Deputy Commissioner of Special Services, Federal Security Agency, Washington, D.C.
 Charles E. Odell, Chief, Employment Counseling, Selective Placement

and Testing Division, United States Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.

Lewis G. Hines, Special Representative, A.F.L., Washington, D.C.

John H. Moore, Executive Director, United Community Defense Services, New York

Family Life Education—Whose Responsibility?

Julian L. Greifer, Director, Neighborhood Center, Philadelphia, presiding

Family Life Education—Whose Responsibility?

1. Preparation for Marriage

Esther E. Sweeney, Director, Division of Community Service, American Social Hygiene Association, New York

2. Education for Responsible Parenthood

Grace C. Mayberg, Supervisor, Family and Children's Service of Minneapolis, Minneapolis

Fees for Social Welfare Services (Continuation of 2:00 P.M. Meeting)

Nathan Cohen, Professor of Social Work, New York School of Social Work, Columbia University, New York, presiding

Fees for Social Welfare Services

1. Problems Involved within the Agency in Administration of a Fee Policy

Alice T. Dashiell, Executive Director, Family Agency of Chester County, West Chester, Pa.

2. Interpretation of Agency Fee Policy to Workers, Clients, Agency Board, and Community

Frances T. Levinson, Associate Executive Director, Jewish Family Service, New York

Panel Discussion

Chairman: Nathan Cohen

Participants:

John A. Ledlie, National Council, Y.M.C.A.'s, New York

Sylvia B. Anderson, American Home Economics Association, New York

Jean Kallenberg, Family Service Association of America, New York

Helen Rowe, Camp Fire Girls, New York

Henrietta L. Gordon, Child Welfare League of America, New York

Esther M. Moore, Community Chests and Councils of America, New York

Securing Adequate Financial Support for Voluntary Local and National Health and Welfare Services

Donald Young, General Director, Russell Sage Foundation, New York, presiding

The Outlook for Financing Voluntary Services for Health, Welfare, and Recreation

Harold J. Seymour, Consultant on Institutional Finance and Public Relations, New York

Panel Discussion

Participants:

John L. Dismukes, American National Red Cross, Washington, D.C.

Henry Blanchard, American Cancer Society, New York
Lyman Ford, Community Chests and Councils of America, New York
Arnold Gurin, Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, New York
Ann Mann, National Tuberculosis Association, New York
Graenum Berger, Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, New York
George W. Rabinoff, National Social Welfare Assembly, New York

Appendix B: Business Organization of the Conference for 1951

OFFICERS

President: Ewan Clague, Washington, D.C.
First Vice President: Frances Taussig, New York
Second Vice President: George F. Davidson, Ottawa, Canada
Third Vice President: Emma C. Puschner, St. Louis
Secretary: Eveline M. Burns, New York
Treasurer: Arch Mandel, New York
Executive Secretary: Joe R. Hoffer, Columbus, Ohio

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Ex-officio: Ewan Clague, President; Frances Taussig, First Vice President; George F. Davidson, Second Vice President; Emma C. Puschner, Third Vice President; Eveline M. Burns, Secretary; Arch Mandel, Treasurer; Lester B. Granger, Past President

Term expiring 1951: Harriet M. Bartlett, Boston; Florence R. Day, Northampton, Mass.; A. A. Heckman, St. Paul, Minn.; Helen Leovy, Pittsburgh; Beth Muller, Chicago; Wilber I. Newstetter, Pittsburgh; Ernest F. Witte, Seattle. *Term expiring 1952:* Robert E. Bondy, New York; Lt. Col. Elwood Camp, Washington, D.C.; George F. Davidson, Ottawa, Canada; Leonard W. Mayo, New York; Phyllis Osborn, Chicago; Florence Sytz, New Orleans; Benjamin E. Youngdahl, St. Louis. *Term expiring 1953:* M. Leo Bohanon, St. Louis; Eleanor Cockerill, Pittsburgh; Frank Hertel, New York; Clara A. Kaiser, New York; Robert H. MacRae, Chicago; Henry L. Zucker, Cleveland

CONFERENCE COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS

Chairman: Isabel P. Kennedy, Pittsburgh

Term expiring 1951: Herschel Alt, New York; Charles F. Ernst, Boston; Arthur E. Fink, Chapel Hill, N.C.; Isabel P. Kennedy, Pittsburgh; Mary S. Labaree, Washington, D.C.; Marietta Stevenson, Urbana, Ill. *Term expiring 1952:* Irene Farnham Conrad, Nashville Tenn.; Leah Feder, Ann Arbor, Mich.; Jeannette Hanford, Chicago; Fred K. Hoehler, Chicago; Bertha B. Howell, Oakland, Calif.; Sue Spencer, Nash-

ville, Tenn.; Walter W. Whitson, Houston, Texas. *Term expiring 1953*: Caroline H. Elledge, Montreal, Canada; Walter B. Johnson, Indianapolis; Peter Kasius, New York; Inabel Burns Lindsay, Washington, D.C.; Ann Elizabeth Neely, New York; Violet M. Sieder, New York; Olive M. Stone, Los Angeles

COMMITTEE ON PROGRAM

Ex-officio: Ewan Clague, Washington, D.C.; Lester B. Granger, New York; Joe R. Hoffer, Columbus, Ohio

Term expiring 1951: Russell W. Ballard, Chicago; William T. Kirk, New York. *Term expiring 1952*: Franklin McKeever, Dayton, Ohio; Lillie H. Nairne, New Orleans. *Term expiring 1953*: Mrs. George H. Abbott, Dallas, Texas; Margaret Hickey, St. Louis

ORGANIZATION OF SECTIONS AND COMMITTEES

SECTION I. SERVICES TO INDIVIDUALS AND FAMILIES

Chairman: Ellen Winston, Raleigh, N.C.

Vice Chairman: Bernice Bish, Kansas City, Mo.

Term expiring 1951: Josephine Brown, Silver Springs, Md.; Louisa FitzSimons, Alexandria, Va.; E. Marguerite Gane, Buffalo, N.Y.; Dorothy Hankins, Philadelphia. *Term expiring 1952*: John Dula, New York; H. M. Margolis, M.D., Pittsburgh; Doris Siegel, Washington, D.C. *Term expiring 1953*: Dorothy L. Baker, New Haven, Conn.; Eva Burmeister, Milwaukee; Hyman S. Lippman, M.D., St. Paul, Minn.

SECTION II. SERVICES TO GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS IN GROUPS

Chairman: Harleigh B. Trecker, Los Angeles

Vice Chairman: Frank L. Weil, New York

Term expiring 1951: Saul Bernstein, Boston; Charles K. Brightbill, Washington, D.C.; Raymond Fisher, Cleveland; Dorothea F. Sullivan, Washington, D.C.; Mrs. Robert Whitelaw Wilson, Washington, D.C. *Term expiring 1952*: Homer C. Bishop, St. Louis; Jean M. Maxwell, New York; Paul Simon, Urbana, Ill. *Term expiring 1953*: Miriam Rosenbloom Cohn, St. Paul, Minn.; Mary I. Madsen, Cleveland; Hazel M. Osborn, New York

SECTION III. SERVICES TO AGENCIES AND COMMUNITIES

Chairman: Edward D. Lynde, Cleveland

Vice Chairman: Father John LaFarge, New York

Term expiring 1951: Felix Gentile, Toledo, Ohio; Sara H. James, Washington, D.C.; Elizabeth S. Magee, Cleveland; Leonard W. Mayo, New York; Violet Sieder, New York. *Term expiring 1952*: Loula

Dunn, Chicago; Melvin A. Glasser, Washington, D.C.; Edna Nicholson, Chicago. *Term expiring 1953*: Alexander J. Allen, Pittsburgh; Myron Falk, Baton Rouge, La.; C. Whit Pfeiffer, Los Angeles

COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

Chairman: John J. Cronin, Storrs, Conn.

Vice Chairman: Hedley S. Dimock, Chicago

Term expiring 1951: M. Ethel Batchelet, Hartford, Conn.; Mrs. Merle Dore, Baton Rouge, La.; Eunice Minton, Washington, D.C.

Term expiring 1952: Mrs. Howard Katzenberg, Southold, N.Y.; Emil M. Sunley, Denver; Irene Tobias, New Orleans. *Term expiring 1953*: John C. Alston, Wilberforce, Ohio; Katherine Kendall, New York; Madeleine Lay, New York

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC RELATIONS

Chairman: Bernard R. Roloff, Chicago

Vice Chairman: E. R. Leibert, New York

Term expiring 1951: Scotia B. Knouff, Newark, N.J.; Albert Taylor, New York; Mary Taylor, Washington, D.C. *Term expiring 1952*: Elmer Andrews, Trenton, N.J.; Sallie Bright, New York; Mary Hobbs Fry, New York. *Term expiring 1953*: Rosemary Morrissey, New Orleans; Richard Overmyer, Cleveland; James Scull, New York

COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL RESEARCH AND SOCIAL STUDIES

Chairman: W. T. McCullough, Philadelphia

Vice Chairman: Sava S. Schwartz, Washington, D.C.

Term expiring 1951: Charles W. Gaughan, Boston; Margaret Hart, Santa Fe, N. Mex.; John Hill, Philadelphia; Ann W. Shyne, New York. *Term expiring 1952*: Peretz A. Katz, Lansing, Mich.; Edward B. Olds, St. Louis; Caroline F. Ware, Washington, D.C. *Term expiring 1953*: Rev. Charles E. Bermingham, Bay Shore, N.Y.; Charles E. Hendry, Toronto, Canada; Alma Holzschuh, Tehachapi, Calif.

Index

- Abbott, Edith, citation of, vii-viii; acceptance speech by, ix-x
 "Acceptance Speech Delivered by Edith Abbott," ix-x
 Accreditation, *see* Education for social work
 Administration of social agencies, 23-24, 32, 68, 158-59, 179-80, 206-14, 226-27, 263-70, 300-302, 323-34, 331-34; boards of social agencies, 127, 258, 305, 307-309, 325
 Adolescent offenders, *see* Juvenile behavior problems
 Adolescents, programs for, *see* Informal education
 Adoption, 230
 Aged, assistance for, *see* Public assistance
 Aged, insurance for, *see* Social insurance
 Aged, the, 49, 124-25, 181-84, 234, 236-43
 Aid to dependent children, *see* Public assistance
 Alcoholism, 249
 Alexander, Sadie T. M., paper by, 304-10
 Aliens and foreign-born, 283
 Alston, Estelle, paper by, 281-94
 "American People in the World Crisis, The," 1-18
 Anderson, Joseph P., paper by, 47-60
 Andrews, Elmer V., paper by, 236-43
 Anthropology and social welfare, 97-113
 Assistance, public, *see* Public assistance
 Barr, Stringfellow, paper by, 1-18
 Bartlett, Harriett M., paper by, 61-72
 "Basic Policies and Principles of Public Child Care Services," 335-48
 Behavior, 97-113; *see also* Juvenile behavior problems
 Black, Bertram J., paper by, 158-69
 Blind, the, 247, 249, 250
 Boards of social agencies, *see* Administration of social agencies
 Branscombe, Martha, paper by, 335-48
 Burmeister, Eva, paper by, 253-62
 Burns, Eveline M., paper by, 181-89
 Camping, 291, 295-303
 Carey, James B., paper by, 82-91
 Casework, *see* Social casework
 "Caseworker's Use of Collateral Information, The," 190-205
 Categorical assistance, *see* Public assistance
 Catholic social work, 224-35; child care, 228-32; displaced persons, 231-32; family welfare work, 225-28; school social services, 233-34
 Central America, *see* Latin America
 Chests, community, *see* Community chests
 Child care, Catholic, *see* Catholic social work
 Child placing, *see* Foster care for children
 Children, aid to dependent, *see* Public assistance
 Children, foster care for, *see* Foster care for children
 Children, protective services for, *see* Child welfare
 Children, White House conference on, *see* Child welfare
 Child welfare, 83, 85-87, 159-61, 199, 228-32, 250, 335-48; Child Welfare League of America, 335-36; Midcentury White House Conference, 73-81; Unmarried parents, 217, 230-31
 Chronic illness, 239-40, 241, 248, 249; nursing homes, 241
 Church social work, *see* Catholic social work; Protestant social work
 "Citation of Edith Abbott," vii-viii
 Citizen participation, *see* Councils in social work
 Civil defense, *see* National emergency, the
 Civil Defense Administration, *see* Federal agencies
 Civil liberties, *see* Civil rights
 Civil rights, 83, 88, 90
 Clague, Ewan, paper by, 114-29
 Clubs, boys' and girls', *see* Informal education

- Cohen, Nathan E., paper by, 271-80
- Collateral information, *see* Social service exchanges
- "Common Core of Social Work in Different Countries, The," 19-36
- Communism, 6, 16-17
- Community centers, Jewish, *see* Jewish social work
- Community chests, 170, 174, 323 ff.
- Community councils, *see* Councils in social work
- Community organization for social welfare, 24, 92-96, 309, 311-22
- Community planning, *see* Community organization for social work
- Community relations, *see* Public relations in social work
- "Community Values in Civil Defense," 92-96
- Community welfare councils, *see* Councils in social work
- Conferences of social work: International Conference of Social Work, 20; Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth, 73-81; *see also* National Conference of Social Work
- Confidentiality, *see* Social service exchanges
- Congress, acts of: Barden-La Follette Act, 246; Social Security Amendments Act, 181
- "Constructive Aspects of Public Assistance for the Aged," 236-43
- Council-agency relations, *see* Councils in social work
- Councils in social work, 313, 315-16, 318-21, 323-34
- Councils of social agencies, *see* Councils in social work
- Counseling, *see* Guidance and counseling
- Counseling, pastoral, *see* Protestant social work
- Crippled, the, 245, 247, 248-49
- "Critical Issues of Council-Agency Relationships," 323-34
- "Current Emphases in Casework under Religious Auspices: I. Integration of Casework and Other Programs," 215-24; "II. Developments in Casework Programs," 224-35
- Curriculum in schools of social work, *see* Education for social work
- Dashiell, Alice T., paper by, 263-70
- Day care for children, *see* Foster care for children
- Deaf and the hard of hearing, the, 247
- Defense mobilization, *see* National emergency, the
- Democracy, 1-18, 48-49, 121, 271-73, 278-80, 304-10, 312-13, 336-38
- Dependency, *see* Public assistance
- Dependent children, *see* Public assistance
- Direct relief, *see* Public assistance
- Disability assistance, *see* Public assistance
- Disability insurance, *see* Social insurance
- Disabled, rehabilitation of, *see* Vocational rehabilitation
- Discrimination, *see* Civil rights; Racial programs in social work
- Displaced persons, *see* Catholic social work; International social work; Protestant social work
- District councils, *see* Councils in social work
- "Dominant and Variant Cultural Value Orientations," 97-113
- Education, 77-78, 83-84; *see also* Education for social work
- Education for social work, 22, 27, 33, 61-72, 300-301; accreditation, 68; curriculum, 65-67, 69; schools of social work, 65 ff.; study of social work education, 61-72
- Edward T. Devine Memorial Award and Plaque, vii-x
- Emotional problems, *see* Mental hygiene
- Employment services: for the aged, 239; for the handicapped, 244, 245
- Epilepsy, *see* Mental Hygiene
- Exchanges, social service, *see* Social service exchanges
- "Fact-finding and Thinking as Tools in Policy-making," 114-29
- Family allowances, *see* Social insurance
- Family life education: marriage counseling, 232-33
- Family social work, 125, 159-61, 197-98, 225-28
- Family welfare work, Catholic, *see* Catholic social work
- Federal agencies: Civil Defense Administration, 92-93; Federal Security Ad-

- ministration, 245; Office of Defense Mobilization, 37 ff.; Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, 246; public assistance, 148-58
- Federal aid, *see* Public welfare
- Federal aid to education, 83-84
- Federal participation in assistance programs, *see* Public assistance
- Federal Security Administration, *see* Federal agencies
- Federations, *see* Councils in social work
- Fees for services, *see* Financing social work
- "Fees for Social Welfare Services," 263-70
- Financing social work, 139-40, 141-42, 170, 174, 325, 327-29; fees for services, 263-70
- Foreign-born, *see* Aliens and foreign-born
- Foreign policy, United States, *see* United States: foreign policy
- Foreign relief and rehabilitation, *see* International social work
- Foster care for children, 85-86, 143-44, 167-68, 216-17, 229, 231-32
- France, 9, 17, 29
- Fund raising, *see* Financing social work
- "Further Needs in the Social Insurance," 181-89
- Geddes, Anne E., paper by, 148-58
- Gershenson, Charles P., paper by, 158-69
- Girls clubs, *see* Informal education
- Girls' work, *see* Informal education
- Governmental health work, *see* Public health
- Governmental social work, *see* Public welfare
- Graham, Frank P., paper by, 37-46
- Griffith, Katharine E., paper by, 224-35
- Group work, *see* Social group work
- "Group Work with Hard-to-reach Teenagers," 281-94
- Guidance and counseling, 219, 223, 232-33
- Handicapped, *see* Blind, the; Crippled, the; Deaf and the hard of hearing, the; Mental hygiene; Vocational rehabilitation
- Hard of hearing, *see* Deaf and the hard of hearing, the
- Hartford, Margaret E., paper by, 295-303
- Health, *see* Medical care; Public health
- Health, public, *see* Public health
- Health and welfare planning, *see* Community organization for social welfare
- Health insurance, *see* Medical care
- Hollis, Ernest V., study by, 61-72
- Hospitals, *see* Medical social work
- Housing, 87-88
- Howard, Donald S., paper by, 19-36
- "Human Aspects of Mobilization, The," 37-46
- Human rights, *see* Civil rights
- Illness, *see* Chronic illness; Medical care
- India, 5, 6-7
- Industrial relations, *see* Labor standards
- Informal education: youth services, 281-94, 295-303
- Institutions for children, *see* Foster care for children
- Insurance, disability, *see* Social insurance
- Insurance, health, *see* Medical care
- Insurance, old age and survivors, *see* Social insurance
- Insurance, social, *see* Social insurance
- "Intercultural and Interracial Relations in Camping," 295-303
- Intergroup work, *see* Community organization for social welfare
- International Conference of Social Work, *see* Conferences of social work
- International relief and rehabilitation, *see* International social work
- International relations, *see* United States: foreign policy
- International social work, 19-36, 120-21, 219-21; displaced persons, 231; France, 29; Great Britain, 20, 22; Point Four Program, 3, 6, 8, 10; Sweden, 30
- Interpretation of social work, *see* Public relations in social work
- Interracial programs, *see* Racial programs in social work
- Israel, 13-15
- Jewish centers, *see* Jewish social work
- Jewish social work: Jewish centers, 275-76, 277-78
- Johns, Ray, paper by, 323-34
- Juvenile behavior problems, 217, 282-83

- Klein, Philip, paper by, 130-47
 Kluckhohn, Florence Rockwood, paper by, 97-113
- Labor and social work, *see* Unions and social work
 Labor and the national emergency, 37-46, 82-91, 252
 Labor-management relations, *see* Labor standards
 Labor relations, *see* Labor standards
 Labor standards, 40 ff.; women in industry, 84-85
 Labor unions, *see* Labor standards; Unions and social work
 Latin America, 2, 7
 "Layman Examines Social Welfare in a Democracy, The," 304-10
 Legislation, promotion of social, *see* Social action
 Likert, Rensis, paper by, 170-80
 Lippitt, Ronald, paper by, 170-80
 Los Angeles Youth Project Special Service Unit, 281-94
- Marriage counseling, *see* Family life education
 Medical care, 239-40, 250; health insurance, 188
 Medical social work, 250
 Mental deficiency, *see* Mental hygiene
 Mental disease, *see* Mental hygiene
 Mental hygiene, 240-41, 249, 314; emotional problems, 229-30; epilepsy, 248; mental deficiency, 229; psychiatric clinics, 233
 Mental illness, *see* Mental hygiene
 Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth, *see* Child welfare
 "Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth, The," 73-81
 Minority groups, *see* Aliens and foreign-born; Civil rights; Racial programs in social work
 "Modern Casework Recording: Integrating Casework and Supervision," 206-14
 "Modern Methods of Measuring Public Reaction and the Application of These Methods to the Social Welfare Field," 170-80
 Multidisciplinary approach, *see* Social work as a profession
- Munro, Marguerite M., paper by, 206-14
- National Conference of Social Work, 126; program, 349-70; business organization for 1951, 371-73
 National Council on Social Work Education, study for, 61-72, 116
 National defense, *see* National emergency, the
 National emergency, the, 10, 37-46, 47-60, 82-91, 92-96, 252, 253-62
 National Social Welfare Assembly, study for, 116
 Neighborhood centers, *see* Settlements and neighborhood centers
 Neighborhood councils, *see* Councils in social work
 Neighborhood houses, *see* Settlements and neighborhood centers
 Nursing homes, *see* Chronic illness
- OASI, *see* Public assistance
 Office of Defense Mobilization, *see* Federal agencies
 Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, *see* Federal agencies
 Old age, *see* Aged, the
 Old age and survivors insurance, *see* Social insurance
 Old age assistance, *see* Public assistance
 Old age insurance, *see* Social insurance
 Old age pensions, *see* Public assistance
- "Past and Future in Social Welfare Research," 130-47
 Pastoral counseling, *see* Protestant social work
 Pensions, *see* Public assistance
 Perkins, Walter M., paper by, 148-58
 Perlman, Helen Harris, paper by, 190-205
 Personality, 98-100, 101-106
 Personnel policies and practices, *see* Personnel standards in social work
 Personnel standards in social work, 128, 179-80, 206-14, 224, 268-69, 300-301, 330, 331, 333
 Philosophy of social work, 19-36, 50 ff., 56 ff., 191-96, 265, 297, 321-22
 "Place of the Sectarian Agency in Services to Groups, The," 271-80

- Point Four Program, *see* International social work
- Professional aspects of social work, *see* Social work as a profession
- Professional curriculum in schools of social work, *see* Education for social work
- Protestant social work, 215-24, 273-75, 278; displaced persons, 219-20; pastoral counseling, 219, 223
- Psychiatric disorders, *see* Mental hygiene
- Psychology and social welfare, 97-113
- "Public Agency Looks at Its Rehabilitation Program, The," 244-52
- Public assistance, 19-20, 29-30, 51, 124-25, 148-58; Aid to Dependent Children, 228; Bureau of Public Assistance, 148-58; disability assistance, 156-57; old age assistance, 125, 155, 236-43
- Public health, 244-52, 311-22
- Publicity in social work, *see* Public relations in social work
- Public relations in social work, 126, 127-28, 170-80, 223, 234-35, 253-62, 297-98, 304-10, 311, 316-18
- Public welfare, 24, 27 ff., 50 ff., 56, 79, 181-89, 221-22, 244-52, 304-10, 311-22, 323-34; state agencies, 148-58, 248-49
- Race relations, *see* Racial programs in social work
- Racial programs in social work, 285-87, 288, 295-303
- Randall, Ollie A., citation by, vii-viii
- Recording, *see* Social casework
- Recreation, 234, 281-94, 295-303
- Rehabilitation, foreign, *see* International social work
- Rehabilitation, vocational, *see* Vocational rehabilitation
- Rehabilitation centers, *see* Vocational rehabilitation
- Reid, Ira De A., paper by, 73-81
- Relief, *see* Public assistance
- Relief, foreign, *see* International social work
- Religion, 78, 80-81
- Religion in social work, *see* Catholic social work; Jewish social work; Protestant social work
- Rent control, *see* Housing
- Research in social work, *see* Social work research
- "Response of Social Work to the Present Challenge, The," 47-60
- Russia, 6, 8, 16
- Salaries in social work, *see* Personnel standards in social welfare
- Sampling, *see* Social work research
- "Sampling for Research in Social Agencies: I. With Large Case Loads," 148-58; "II. With Small Case Loads," 158-69
- School health services, 250
- School social services, Catholic, 233-34
- School social work, *see* School social services
- Scientific research, 117-19
- Sectarian social work, *see* Catholic social work; Jewish social work; Protestant social work
- Segregation, *see* Civil rights
- Settlements and neighborhood centers, 276-77
- Sieder, Violet M., paper by, 311-22
- "Significance of the Study of Social Work Education, The," 61-72
- Social action, 83-84, 86, 88, 89-90
- Social casework, 66, 125-26, 137-39, 142, 158-61, 190-205, 215-24, 224-35, 250, 253-62, 263-70; recording, 206-14
- Social group work, 139-40, 162, 234, 271-80, 281-94
- Social insurance, 181-89; disability insurance, 186-87; family allowances, 188; old age and survivors insurance, 124-25, 155-56, 181-84; unemployment insurance, 184-86; workmen's compensation, 187
- Social intergroup work, *see* Community organization for social work
- Social legislation, promotion of, *see* Social action
- Social planning, *see* Community organization for social work
- Social planning councils, *see* Councils in social work
- Social research, *see* Social work research
- Social sciences, *see* Social work research
- Social security program, *see* Child welfare; Public assistance; Public health; Public welfare; Social insurance
- Social service exchanges, 190-205
- Social Welfare Administration*, discussed, 32

- Social work, financing of, *see* Financing of social work
- Social work, governmental, *see* Public welfare
- Social work, international, *see* International social work
- Social work and the national emergency, 37-46, 47-60, 253-62
- Social work as a profession, 26, 32-34, 52 ff., 61-72, 115-16, 144-47, 191-93, 201-202, 223, 263, 264-65, 314; multidisciplinary approach, 26
- Social work conferences, *see* Conferences of social work; National Conference of Social Work
- Social work councils, *see* Councils in social work
- Social work education, *see* Education for social work
- Social Work Education in the United States*, discussed, 61-72
- Social workers, personnel standards for, *see* Personnel standards
- Social work interpretation, *see* Public relations in social work
- Social work personnel, *see* Personnel standards
- Social work practice, *see* Social work as a profession
- Social work publicity, *see* Public relations in social work
- Social work research, 61-72, 121-24, 126-28, 128-29, 130-47, 148-58, 158-69, 257, 309-10; sampling, 148-58, 158-69, 171-80; statistics, 57-58, 74-76, 148-58, 158-69, 170-80, 236-37; surveys and studies, 115-17, 130-34, 134-36, 137-40, 148-58, 160-62, 170-80
- Social work statistics, *see* Social work research
- Sociology and social welfare, 97-113
- "Solving Health and Welfare Problems through Neighborhood Participation," 311-22
- South America, *see* Latin America
- "Special Needs of Congested Communities and Defense Workers," 82-91
- State public welfare agencies, *see* Public welfare
- Statistics, social work, *see* Social work research
- Survey Award, vii-x
- Surveys, social, *see* Social work research
- Survivors insurance, *see* Social insurance
- Switzer, Mary E., paper by, 244-52
- Taylor, Alice L., study by, 61-72
- Technical Assistance Program, *see* International social work, Point Four Program
- Teen-age programs, *see* Informal Education
- Training for social work, *see* Education for social work
- Unemployment insurance, *see* Social insurance
- Unions and social work, 86, 90-91
- United Nations, 10, 29, 32, 33
- United States: foreign policy, 1-18, 120-21
- United States Department of Labor, 38
- Veterans benefits and services, 247-48
- Vocational rehabilitation, 244-52; rehabilitation centers, 247-49
- Volunteers in social work, 223-24, 234, 317
- Wadsworth, James J., paper by, 92-96
- Welfare councils, *see* Councils in social work
- Welfare federations, *see* Community chests; Councils in social work
- Welfare planning, *see* Community Organization for social welfare
- "What Can Casework Say to the Public in These Times?" 253-62
- White House Conference on Children and Youth, *see* Child welfare
- Whiting, Henry J., paper by, 215-24
- Women in industry, *see* Labor standards
- Youth services, *see* Informal education

